

Mosco Type Convergence of Bilinear Forms and Weak Convergence of n -Particle Systems

Jörg-Uwe Löbus
 Matematiska institutionen
 Linköpings universitet
 SE-581 83 Linköping
 Sverige

Abstract In the paper we pursue two interests. On the one hand, we are concerned with both the concept of Mosco type convergence for non-symmetric n -particle systems and, at the same time, relative compactness of such n -particle processes. On the other hand, we would like to apply the general results to an n -particle Fleming-Viot system $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ in a bounded d -dimensional domain D . It turns out that integration by parts relative to the initial measure and the generator is the appropriate mathematical tool. For finitely many particles, such integration by parts is established by using probabilistic arguments. For the limiting infinite dimensional configuration we use methods from infinite dimensional non-gaussian calculus.

AMS subject classification (2000) primary 47D07, secondary 60K35, 60J35

Keywords Mosco type convergence, n -particle systems, weak convergence

1 Introduction

In order to introduce the basic setting, let ν be a probability measure on a measurable space $(E, \mathcal{B})$, and let $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a strongly continuous contraction semigroup of linear operators on $L^2(E, \nu)$. Suppose that $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is associated with a transition probability function $P(t, x, B)$, $t \geq 0$, $x \in E$, $B \in \mathcal{B}$, i. e., $T_t f = \int f(y) P(t, \cdot, dy)$, $t \geq 0$, $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Assume, furthermore, that $P(t, \cdot, E) = 1$ ν -a.e., $t \geq 0$.

Denoting by $(A, D(A))$ the generator of $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product in $L^2(E, \nu)$, we introduce now the class of bilinear forms S we are interested in. Define

$$D(S) := \left\{ u \in L^2(E, \nu) : \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left\langle \frac{1}{t}(u - T_t u), v \right\rangle \text{ exists for all } v \in L^2(E, \nu) \right\}$$

and

$$S(u, v) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left\langle \frac{1}{t}(u - T_t u), v \right\rangle, \quad u \in D(S), \quad v \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

We have $D(A) = D(S)$ according to [16], Section 2.1 and

$$S(u, v) = -\langle Au, v \rangle, \quad u \in D(A), \quad v \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

In this sense we would like to understand the term *bilinear form*. However, as it is customary for Mosco (type) convergence, we also set $S(u, v) := \infty$ if $u \in L^2(E, \nu) \setminus D(S)$ and $v \in$

$L^2(E, \nu)$. Let $(G_\beta)_{\beta>0}$ be the resolvent associated with S , i. e., $G_\beta = (\beta - A)^{-1}$, $\beta > 0$. Using contractivity of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(E, \nu)$ and

$$\langle T_t u, u \rangle^2 \leq \langle T_t u, T_t u \rangle \langle u, u \rangle$$

one shows positivity of the form S , that is $S(u, u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in D(S)$. This observation is crucial for the whole concept of Mosco type convergence of sequences S_n of forms on sequences of spaces $L^2(E_n, \nu_n)$ to a limiting form S on $L^2(E, \nu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, we also develop a framework of Mosco type convergence of sequences of forms when contractivity is replaced by a technical condition on $A'_n \mathbb{1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $A' \mathbb{1}$ where $\mathbb{1}$ is the constant function taking the value one and the $'$ refers to the dual generator.

The first question that arises is on the definition of such a bilinear form. In fact, we construct the weak generator of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$, the second entry v in $S(u, v)$ is in this sense just a test function. This definition of a bilinear form is far away from classical Dirichlet form theory which includes the notion of Mosco convergence. It has been chosen according to the application we are interested in Section 4 of the paper. The result obtained in Subsection 4.6 gives rise to state that our approach to bilinear forms is beneficial relative to the particle system we have investigated. We also want to refer to a discussion on choosing the appropriate definition of bilinear forms relative to the mathematical situation, given in [14], Subsections 2.1 and 2.2.

The second problem one comes across is the existence of $A'_n \mathbb{1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $A' \mathbb{1}$ having properties which are useful to show Mosco type convergence. This is a purely mathematical issue. In the application of the present paper, a Fleming-Viot type particle system, it restricts the initial configurations of the particles.

We would like to refer to related research carried out in [9], [10], [11], and [12].

Besides the independent interest in Mosco type convergence, it turns out that Mosco type convergence is an effective tool to approach relative compactness of n -particle systems. In fact it can be used as one of two basic steps in order to establish relative compactness. A corresponding theorem is proved in Section 3. The second basic step in this context for relative compactness is to show that capacities of the n -particle processes $\mathbf{X}^n$ of the form $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} e^{-\beta \tau}$ tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here, $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}$ is the expectation with respect to the distribution ν_n of the initial configurations of $\mathbf{X}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, τ is the first exit time of $\mathbf{X}^n$ from sets of the form $\{|\beta G_{n,\beta} g - f| \geq \varepsilon_n \|g\|\}$ where $\varepsilon_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$, and $f = \beta G_\beta g$. Furthermore, g is a continuous function on the space of probability measures over the state space of the particles, and $G_{n,\beta}$ and G_β are the resolvents of $\mathbf{X}^n$ and the limiting process $\mathbf{X}$.

The idea of such a two step program in order to approach relative compactness has been taken from [17].

In Section 4, we are then interested in applying the general Mosco type convergence and the relative compactness result to an n -particle system $X^n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ in a bounded d -dimensional domain D the dynamics of which can be described as follows: During periods in which none of the particles $X_1, \dots, X_n$ hit the boundary ∂D , the system behaves like n independent d -dimensional Brownian motions. When one of the particles hits the boundary ∂D , then it instantaneously jumps to the inside of D in a way that its distribution and the empirical distribution of the particles have the same weak limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ assuming that the empirical distribution of the particles has a weak limit. The latter is a property of the system investigated in [2]. In this context we want to refer to [5].

The class of initial configurations we have chosen for the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is a fairly general class of random smooth initial configurations. However in order to show both,

relative compactness and Mosco type convergence, the initial configurations of the n -particle systems converge to the limiting initial configuration in a rather restricted way.

Integration by parts relative to the initial measure and the generator is the crucial mathematical technique to verify Mosco type convergence. To establish such integration by parts for the n -particle systems we use mainly probabilistic arguments, cf. Subsections 4.3-4.5. For the limiting infinite dimensional system, the theory developed in [4] is the appropriate tool, cf. Subsection 4.2.

The structure of Section 4 is chronological in the following sense. First we introduce the relevant objects for the limiting configuration and prove the integration by parts formula for the limiting system (Subsections 4.1 and 4.2). Then we derive asymptotic properties of the n -particle system and formulate reasonable conditions for its initial configuration (Subsections 4.3 and 4.4). Integration by parts for the n -particle system is established in Subsection 4.5. In Subsections 4.6 and 4.7 we use the asymptotic properties and the integration by parts formulas for both, the n -particle system and the limiting system, to verify Mosco type convergence as well as relative compactness for the Fleming-Viot system.

2 Mosco Type Convergence

In this section, we are extending the framework of [14] in several ways. In Subsection 2.1, we develop the concept of convergence in sequences of L^2 -spaces. This is necessary in order to establish the Mosco type convergence for non-symmetric forms on sequences of L^2 -spaces presented in Subsection 2.2. In Subsection 2.3, we are then able to handle convergence of non-symmetric non-positive forms, the situation we have to face in the application in Section 4.

Again, we want to refer to related research carried out in K. Kuwae, T. Shioya [12] and compared with ours in [14], Subsection 3.2.

2.1 Analysis on Sequences of L^2 -Spaces

Let ν_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be mutually orthogonal probability measures on $(E, \mathcal{B})$. For notational convenience, we will mostly use the symbol ν instead of ν_0 . Suppose that ν is a measure with countable base on $(E, \mathcal{B})$. In addition, assume that there are mutually exclusive subsets E_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, of E such that $\nu_n(E \setminus E_n) = 0$. Let α_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, be a sequence of positive numbers with $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = 1$. Define $\mathbb{M} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \nu_n$. We say that $u \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} L^2(E, \nu_n)$ if u is an equivalence class consisting of all everywhere defined $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable functions satisfying $f_1 = f_2$ $\mathbb{M}$ -a.e. if $f_1, f_2 \in u$ and $\int u^2 d\nu_n < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ denote the inner product in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the inner product in $L^2(E, \nu)$. Introduce

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ \varphi \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} L^2(E, \nu_n) : \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle \right\}.$$

Suppose that there exists a linear subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{D}$ which is dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$ and let $\mathcal{C}$ denote the set of all functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (c1) For each $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists a *representing sequence* $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{F}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\varphi = \varphi_n$, ν_n -a.e., $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(c2) $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{F}$.

Introduce

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{ \psi \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} L^2(E, \nu_n) : \sigma \in \mathcal{D}, \tau \in \mathcal{F} \text{ imply } \sigma\psi \in \mathcal{D}, \tau\psi \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.1 (a) $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

(b) The set $\mathcal{C}$ is linear.

(c) The set $\mathcal{C}$ is dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$.

(d) Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}$. We have $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$.

(e) Let $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$. Then, for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\varphi\psi \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. (a) (c1) is trivial and (c2) follows from linearity of $\mathcal{F}$.

(b) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}$ with representing sequences $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\psi_n \in \mathcal{F}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, cf. condition (c2). Since (c1) and (c2) are obvious for $\varphi + \psi$, it remains to show that $\varphi + \psi \in \mathcal{D}$. We can choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi - \tilde{\psi}, \psi - \tilde{\psi} \rangle &< \varepsilon && \text{since } \mathcal{F} \subseteq L^2(E, \nu), \text{ densely,} \\ |\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle| &< \varepsilon && \text{since } \varphi \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}, \\ |\langle \psi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \psi, \psi \rangle| &< \varepsilon && \text{since } \psi \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}, \\ |\langle \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| &< \varepsilon && \text{since } \tilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}, \\ |\langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| &< \varepsilon, && \text{cf. (c2),} \\ |\langle \psi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \psi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| &< \varepsilon, && \text{cf. (c2).} \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi - \tilde{\psi}, \psi - \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n &\leq \langle \psi - \tilde{\psi}, \psi - \tilde{\psi} \rangle \\ &\quad + |\langle \psi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \psi, \psi \rangle| + |\langle \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| + 2|\langle \psi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \psi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| \\ &< 5\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n| &\leq \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle \psi - \tilde{\psi}, \psi - \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n^{1/2} \\ &< \sqrt{5} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle| &\leq |\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n| + |\langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle| + |\langle \varphi, \tilde{\psi} \rangle - \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle| \\ &< \varepsilon + \left(\sqrt{5} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} + \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2} \right) \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

It follows now from (2.1) and (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \varphi + \psi, \varphi + \psi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi + \psi, \varphi + \psi \rangle| &\leq |\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle| + |\langle \psi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \psi, \psi \rangle| + 2|\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle| \\ &< 4\varepsilon + \left(2\sqrt{5} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} + 2\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2} \right) \cdot \varepsilon^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

(c) This is a consequence of (a) and the fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$.

(d) This follows from (2.2).

(e) Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$. By hypothesis, we have $\varphi\psi \in \mathcal{D}$. Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{F}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be the representing sequence of φ , cf. (c1). Then $\varphi_n\psi \in \mathcal{F}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by hypothesis. In other words, $\varphi_n\psi \in \mathcal{F}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is the representing sequence of $\varphi\psi$, i. e., we have (c1) for $\varphi\psi$. Furthermore, for all $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\psi\rho \in \mathcal{F}$ by hypothesis and, by (c2), $\langle \varphi, \psi\rho \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \psi\rho \rangle$. Thus, $\langle \varphi\psi, \rho \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi\psi, \rho \rangle$. Thus, we have (c2) for $\varphi\psi$. $\square$

Definition 2.2 (a) A sequence $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is said to be *w-convergent* to $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (in symbols $\varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi$) if

(i) $\langle \varphi_n, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$.

(b) A sequence $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is said to be *s-convergent* to $\psi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (in symbols $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi$) if

(i) ψ_n w-converges to ψ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

(ii) $\langle \psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi, \psi \rangle$.

(c) Speaking of *w-convergence* or *s-convergence* of subsequences $\varphi_{n_k} \in \mathcal{C}$ or $\psi_{n_k} \in \mathcal{C}$, respectively, will mean that in (a) or (b) the index $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is replaced with $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remarks (1) Note that according to the definition of $\mathcal{C}$, we have the following implication: If $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s-converges to $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_n - \psi, \psi_n - \psi \rangle_n &= \langle \psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n - 2\langle \psi_n, \psi \rangle_n + \langle \psi, \psi \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

(2) Let $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (d), that $\psi_n := \psi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s-converges to ψ .

Proposition 2.3 (a) Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w-convergent to $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\langle \varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is bounded.

(b) Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence such that $\langle \varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_n$ is bounded. Then there exists a subsequence $\varphi_{n_k} \in \mathcal{C}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, w-convergent to some $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(c) Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w-convergent to $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and let $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence that s-converges to $\psi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$.

(d) Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w-converging to $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and let $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w-converging to $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose

$$\langle \varphi_n - \varphi, \psi_n - \psi \rangle_n \geq 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.3)$$

Then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \geq \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle.$$

(e) Let $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w-convergent to $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$. Then we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_n \geq \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle.$$

In the following, let $\psi_n \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\psi \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, and assume $\psi_n \rho \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi \rho$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{C}$.

(f) Let $\mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Then $\varphi_n \psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi \psi$.

(g) Let $\mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Then $\varphi_n \psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \varphi \psi$.

Proof. For the proofs of (a) through (c), we will refer to [14].

(a) and (c) The situation in Section 3 of [14] is compatible with the setting here. In particular, there it is assumed that E is a metric space and Definition 3.1 yields a linear set $\mathcal{C}$. Replacing in the statement of [14], Lemma 3.2 (b), $C_b(E)$ by $\mathcal{F}$ and using the above properties of $\mathcal{F}$ the assertion of [14], Lemma 3.2 (b), becomes obvious. The proofs of Proposition 3.3 (a) and (b) can now be followed word for word with $\mathcal{F}$ instead of $C_b(E)$. In this way, we have verified (a) and (c) of the present proposition.

(b) This has been demonstrated in [14], proof of Proposition 2.3 (a).

(d) Because of $\varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi$, $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \psi$, and $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\langle \varphi_n, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$, $\langle \varphi, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$, and $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$. The lemma is now a consequence of hypothesis (2.3) and

$$\langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n = \langle \varphi_n, \psi \rangle_n + \langle \varphi, \psi_n \rangle_n - \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n + \langle \varphi_n - \varphi, \psi_n - \psi \rangle_n.$$

(e) This is an immediate consequence of part (d).

(f) Let $\rho \in \mathcal{C}$. According to Lemma 2.1 (e) and hypotheses, we have $\varphi_n \psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{C} \ni \psi_n \rho \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi \rho \in L^2(E, \nu)$. From part (c), we obtain

$$\langle \varphi_n \psi_n, \rho \rangle_n = \langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rho \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi, \psi \rho \rangle = \langle \varphi \psi, \rho \rangle.$$

(g) It remains to note that by parts (c) and (f), we have $\varphi_n \psi_n^2 \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi \psi^2$ which yields by part (c)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_n \psi_n, \varphi_n \psi_n \rangle &= \langle \varphi \psi_n, \varphi_n \psi_n \rangle_n + \langle \varphi_n - \varphi, \varphi_n \psi_n^2 \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi \psi, \varphi \psi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2 Mosco Type Convergence of Non-Symmetric Forms on Sequences of L^2 -Spaces

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ be a strongly continuous contraction semigroup in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$ and let $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a strongly continuous contraction semigroup in $L^2(E, \nu)$. Denote by S_n , A_n , $(G_{n,\beta})_{\beta > 0}$ the bilinear form in the sense of Section 1, the generator, and the family of resolvents associated with $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, let S , A , and $(G_\beta)_{\beta > 0}$ the bilinear form, the generator, and the family of resolvents associated with $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$. For $\beta > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi_n \in D(S_n)$, $\psi_n \in L^2(E, \nu_n)$, set $S_{n,\beta}(\varphi_n, \psi_n) := \beta \langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n + S_n(\varphi_n, \psi_n)$, and for $\varphi \in D(S)$, $\psi \in L^2(E, \nu)$, define $S_\beta(\varphi, \psi) := \beta \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle + S(\varphi, \psi)$.

Definition 2.4 We say that S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *pre-converges* to S if

- (i) For every $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and every subsequence $\varphi_{n_k} \in D(S_{n_k}) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, w -converging to φ such that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$, we have

$$S(\varphi, \varphi) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n_k}(\varphi_{n_k}, \varphi_{n_k}).$$

- (ii) For every $\psi \in D(S)$, there exists a sequence $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -converging to ψ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n(\psi_n, \psi_n) \leq S(\psi, \psi).$$

Lemma 2.5 *Let S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of bilinear forms pre-convergent to S . In addition, let $w_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w -converging to some $w \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and let $v_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence s -converging to $v \in D(S)$ in the sense of condition (ii) of Definition 2.4. Suppose $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n w_n, A_n w_n \rangle_n < \infty$.*

(a) *The limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n(v_n, w_n) + S_n(w_n, v_n))$ exists and we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n(v_n, w_n) + S_n(w_n, v_n)) = S(v, w) + S(w, v).$$

(b) *For $\beta > 0$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(w_n, w_n) < \infty$ then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_{n,\beta}(v_n, w_n) + S_{n,\beta}(w_n, v_n)) = S_\beta(v, w) + S_\beta(w, v).$$

The lemma holds also for subsequences n_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of indices.

Proof. See [14], proof of Lemma 2.5. However note the difference in the definition of pre-convergence, cf. condition (i) in Definition 2.4. Note also that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n w_n, A_n w_n \rangle_n < \infty$ implies by Proposition 2.3 (a) the corresponding assumptions of Lemma 2.5 in [14]. $\square$

Let us introduce the following condition.

- (c3) (i) $\mathcal{G} := \{G_\beta g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the sense that for every $g \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\beta > 0$, there is a $u \in \mathcal{C}$ with $G_\beta g = u$ ν -a.e.
- (ii) $\mathcal{G}_n := \{G_{n,\beta} g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in the sense that for every $g \in \mathcal{C}$, $\beta > 0$, and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a $v \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $G_{n,\beta} g = v$ ν_n -a.e.
- (iii) $\mathcal{G}' := \{G'_\beta g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.
- (iv) $\mathcal{G}'_n := \{G'_{n,\beta} g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark (3) Imposing condition (i) on S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S , we implicitly require that $\varphi \in D(S)$. On the one hand we suppose that $\varphi_{n_k} \in D(S_{n_k}) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, w -converges to φ . This implies $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \varphi_{n_k}, \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$ by Proposition 2.3 (a). On the other hand, we require $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$. Thus

$$S(\varphi, \varphi) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n_k}(\varphi_{n_k}, \varphi_{n_k}) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle -A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$$

which, by definition, says that $\varphi \in D(S)$.

Conversely, in order to verify condition (i) in Definition 2.4, it makes sense to show that $D(S_{n_k}) \cap \mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_{n_k} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$ imply $\varphi \in D(S) = D(A)$. This is how we proceed in the proof of Proposition 4.11, Step 3.

Lemma 2.6 *Let S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of bilinear forms pre-convergent to S . Furthermore, let $\beta > 0$ and let $u_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a w -convergent sequence with $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n u_n, A_n u_n \rangle_n < \infty$. Let $u \in D(S)$. Introduce the following conditions.*

(iii) Let u_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and u as above.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \psi_n) = S_\beta(u, \psi) \quad (2.4)$$

for all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) = S_\beta(\psi, u) \quad (2.5)$$

for all $\psi \in D(S)$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ .

(iv) Let u_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and u as above. If $\beta u_n - A_n u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \beta u - Au$ then $u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} u$.

Then (iv) implies (iii).

Remark (4) In (iii), we require that (2.4) holds for all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ . It is equivalent to replace in this sentence $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ by $\psi \in \mathcal{C}'$ for any dense subset $\mathcal{C}'$ of $L^2(E, \nu)$. For this, recall also Proposition 2.3 (a).

Proof. Let us assume (iv) and (2.4). We verify (2.5). For this, let us specify for a moment $\psi_n := \psi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows then from Remark (2) and (2.4) that $\beta u_n - A_n u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \beta u - Au$. Condition (iv) implies now that $u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} u$. From Lemma 2.5 and (2.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) + S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \psi_n)\} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \psi_n) \\ &= \{S_\beta(\psi, u) + S_\beta(u, \psi)\} - S_\beta(u, \psi) \\ &= S_\beta(\psi, u) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\psi \in D(S)$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ . $\square$

Definition 2.4 continued Let S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of bilinear forms pre-convergent to S . If, in addition, condition (iii) is satisfied, then we say that S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges to S .

Theorem 2.7 Let $\beta > 0$, suppose that conditions (c1) – (c3) are satisfied, and assume that S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converges to S in the sense of Definition 2.4.

(a) For all $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and all sequences $f_n \in \mathcal{C}$ w -converging to f , $G_{n,\beta} f_n$ w -converges to $G_\beta f$ and $G'_{n,\beta} f_n$ w -converges to $G'_\beta f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) For all $g \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and all sequences $g_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to g , $G_{n,\beta} g_n$ s -converges to $G_\beta g$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. In Step 1 below, we will show that for all $g \in \mathcal{C}$, $G_{n,\beta} g$ s -converges to $G_\beta g$. In Step 2 we will use the ideas of Step 1 to prove that for all $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and all sequences $f_n \in \mathcal{C}$ w -converging to f , $G_{n,\beta} f_n$ w -converges to $G_\beta f$. In Step 3, we will demonstrate that for all $g \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and all sequences $g_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to g , $G_{n,\beta} g_n$ s -converges to $G_\beta g$. Finally, Step 4 will be devoted to the verification of the second part of (a) as a consequence of part (b).

Step 1 Fix $g \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\beta > 0$. Set $u_n := G_{n,\beta} g$. Because of $\langle u_n, u_n \rangle_n^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_{n' \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g, g \rangle_{n'}^{1/2} < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and Proposition 2.3 (b), there exists a subsequence u_{n_k} , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, w -converging to some $\tilde{u} \in L^2(E, \nu)$. For this, recall also condition (c3). Because of Remark (3), we even may conclude $\tilde{u} \in D(S)$ since

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} u_{n_k}, A_{n_k} u_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \beta u_{n_k} - g, \beta u_{n_k} - g \rangle_{n_k} \leq 4 \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g, g \rangle_{n_k} < \infty.$$

Set $u := G_\beta g$ and let $\psi \in D(S)$. We have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(G_{n,\beta}g, \psi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle g, \psi_n \rangle_n = \langle g, \psi \rangle = S_\beta(G_\beta g, \psi)$ for all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to ψ . Thus, condition (iii) of Definition 2.4, Remark (4), and Lemma 2.5 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} S_\beta(\psi, u) + S_\beta(u, \psi) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{S_{n_k, \beta}(\psi_{n_k}, G_{n_k, \beta}g) + S_{n_k, \beta}(G_{n_k, \beta}g, \psi_{n_k})\} \\ &= S_\beta(\psi, \tilde{u}) + S_\beta(\tilde{u}, \psi) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

for all $\psi \in D(S)$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to ψ in the sense of condition (ii) of Definition 2.4. Note that, in order to use Lemma 2.5, we verify $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n u_n, A_n u_n \rangle_n < \infty$ as above.

Applying (2.6) to both, $\psi = u$ and $\psi = \tilde{u}$, we conclude $S_\beta(u - \tilde{u}, u - \tilde{u}) = 0$ and thus $u = \tilde{u}$. In other words, $G_{n,\beta}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta g$, independent of the above chosen subsequence n_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$. $G_{n,\beta}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$ is now a consequence of Proposition 2.3 (e), condition (c3) (ii), and Definition 2.4 (i), which imply

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \langle G_\beta g, G_\beta g \rangle + S(G_\beta g, G_\beta g) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\beta \langle G_{n,\beta}g, G_{n,\beta}g \rangle_n + S_n(G_{n,\beta}g, G_{n,\beta}g)\} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle g, G_{n,\beta}g \rangle_n \\ &= \langle g, G_\beta g \rangle \\ &= \beta \langle G_\beta g, G_\beta g \rangle + S(G_\beta g, G_\beta g) \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle G_{n,\beta}g, G_{n,\beta}g \rangle_n = \langle G_\beta g, G_\beta g \rangle$.

Step 2 Let $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$, $f_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w -converging to f . Set $u_n := G_{n,\beta}f_n$. By Proposition 2.3 (a) we have $\langle u_n, u_n \rangle_n^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_{n' \in \mathbb{N}} \langle f_{n'}, f_{n'} \rangle_{n'}^{1/2} < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Because of Proposition 2.3 (b) and Remark (3) there exists a subsequence u_{n_k} w -converging to some $\tilde{u} \in D(S)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Here we have used

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} u_{n_k}, A_{n_k} u_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \beta u_{n_k} - f_{n_k}, \beta u_{n_k} - f_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} \leq 4 \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle f_{n_k}, f_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty,$$

the latter by Proposition 2.3 (a).

Set $u := G_\beta f$ and let $\psi \in D(S)$. As in Step 1, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(G_{n,\beta}f_n, \psi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, \psi_n \rangle_n = \langle f, \psi \rangle = S_\beta(G_\beta f, \psi)$ for all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to ψ . Thus, condition (iii) of Definition 2.4, Remark (4), and Lemma 2.5 yield as in Step 1 $S_\beta(\psi, u) + S_\beta(u, \psi) = S_\beta(\psi, \tilde{u}) + S_\beta(\tilde{u}, \psi)$ for all $\psi \in D(S)$. Note again that, in order to use Lemma 2.5, we have $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} u_{n_k}, A_{n_k} u_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$. Again we may conclude $u = \tilde{u}$. We have thus verified $G_{n,\beta}f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta f$, independent of the above chosen subsequence n_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Step 3 Now, let $g \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and $g_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} g$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and choose $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\langle g - \tilde{g}, g - \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} < \varepsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\langle G_{n,\beta}g_n, \varphi \rangle_n - \langle G_\beta g, \varphi \rangle) - (\langle G_{n,\beta}\tilde{g}, \varphi \rangle_n - \langle G_\beta \tilde{g}, \varphi \rangle)| \\ &\leq |\langle G_{n,\beta}(g_n - \tilde{g}), \varphi \rangle_n| + |\langle G_\beta(g - \tilde{g}), \varphi \rangle| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\beta} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} (\langle g_n, g_n \rangle_n - 2\langle g_n, \tilde{g} \rangle_n + \langle \tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rangle_n)^{1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{1}{\beta} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2} \langle g - \tilde{g}, g - \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2} = \frac{2\varepsilon}{\beta} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with $G_{n,\beta}\tilde{g} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta \tilde{g}$ (cf. Step 1), this implies $G_{n,\beta}g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta g$. Similarly, we obtain

$$|(\langle G_{n,\beta}g_n, G_{n,\beta}g_n \rangle_n - \langle G_\beta g, G_\beta g \rangle) - (\langle G_{n,\beta}\tilde{g}, G_{n,\beta}\tilde{g} \rangle_n - \langle G_\beta \tilde{g}, G_\beta \tilde{g} \rangle)|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |\langle G_{n,\beta}(g_n + \tilde{g}), G_{n,\beta}(g_n - \tilde{g}) \rangle_n| + |\langle G_\beta(g + \tilde{g}), G_\beta(g - \tilde{g}) \rangle| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta^2} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g_n + \tilde{g}, g_n + \tilde{g} \rangle_n^{1/2} (\langle g_n, g_n \rangle_n - 2\langle g_n, \tilde{g} \rangle_n + \langle \tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rangle_n)^{1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^2} \langle g + \tilde{g}, g + \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta^2} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g_n + \tilde{g}, g_n + \tilde{g} \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle g - \tilde{g}, g - \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^2} \langle g + \tilde{g}, g + \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^2} \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g_n + \tilde{g}, g_n + \tilde{g} \rangle_n^{1/2} + \langle g + \tilde{g}, g + \tilde{g} \rangle^{1/2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

note that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle g_n + \tilde{g}, g_n + \tilde{g} \rangle_n^{1/2} < \infty$ since $g_n + \tilde{g} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} g + \tilde{g}$. Together with $G_{n,\beta} \tilde{g} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta \tilde{g}$ (cf. Step 1), and $G_{n,\beta} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta g$, this implies $G_{n,\beta} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$.

Step 4 Let $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$, $f_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence w -converging to f , and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$. By the result of Step 1 and Proposition 2.3 (c), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle G'_{n,\beta} f_n, \varphi \rangle_n &= \langle f_n, G_{n,\beta} \varphi \rangle_n \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, G_\beta \varphi \rangle \\
&= \langle G'_\beta f, \varphi \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

This means nothing but $G'_{n,\beta} f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G'_\beta f$. $\square$

Lemma 2.8 *Let S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of bilinear forms pre-convergent to S . Condition (iii) implies condition (iv).*

Proof. Suppose we have condition (iii). Let us also assume that $\beta u_n - A_n u_n$ w -converges to $\beta u - Au$. We show that u_n w -converges to u .

For all $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ , we have because of Proposition 2.3 (c),

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \psi_n) &= \langle \beta u_n - A_n u_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \beta u - Au, \psi \rangle \\
&= S_\beta(u, \psi).
\end{aligned}$$

From condition (iii), it follows that

$$S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} S_\beta(\psi, u).$$

for all $\psi \in D(S)$ and all sequences $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s -convergent to ψ . In particular, we can take $g \in \mathcal{C}$, $\psi_n := G_{n,\beta} g$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\psi := G_\beta g$. For this, recall also condition (c3). According to Theorem 2.7, $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle g, u_n \rangle_n &= S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} S_\beta(\psi, u) \\
&= \langle g, u \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

which means that $u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} u$. We have verified (iv). $\square$

Remarks (5) Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.8 together show that under (i) and (ii) of Definition 2.4, conditions (iii) and (iv) are equivalent.

(6) By virtue of Remark (1), and condition (c3), from Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 2.3 (d) it follows that

$$\langle G_{n,\beta}g - G_\beta g, G_{n,\beta}g - G_\beta g \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle G'_{n,\beta}g, G'_{n,\beta}g \rangle_n \geq \langle G'_\beta g, G'_\beta g \rangle, \quad g \in \mathcal{C}.$$

In order to prove convergence of forms S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, to a form S let us introduce one more condition:

(c4) $D(S) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the sense that for every $\varphi \in D(S)$, there is a $u \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\psi = u$ ν -a.e.

In the next proposition we formulate conditions under which (i)-(iii) of Definition 2.4 become necessary. For this recall Remark (3).

Proposition 2.9 *Suppose that conditions (c1) – (c4) are satisfied. Let $(G_\beta)_{\beta \geq 0}$ be the resolvent of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^2(E, \nu)$ and let $(G_{n,\beta})_{\beta \geq 0}$ be the resolvent of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^2(E, \nu_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose we have the following.*

(i) $G_{n,\beta}g$ s -converges to $G_\beta g$ and $G'_{n,\beta}g$ s -converges to $G'_\beta g$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for every $g \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\beta > 0$.

(ii) $\psi \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C} = D(A_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$ implies $\psi \in D(A'_n)$.

(iii) Let $D(S_{n_k}) \cap \mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_{n_k} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$ such that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$. Then $\varphi \in D(S)$ and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A'_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A'_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$.

Then the forms S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, associated with $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ converge to the form S associated with $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the sense of Definition 2.4.

Proof. Step 1 In the first two steps, we verify condition (i) of Definition 2.4. For a clearer presentation, we ignore subsequences. Let us introduce bilinear forms $S^{(\beta)}(w, w) := \beta \langle w - \beta G_\beta w, w \rangle$, $w \in D(S)$, and $S_n^{(\beta)}(w_n, w_n) := \beta \langle w_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} w_n, w_n \rangle_n$, $w_n \in D(S_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which can be considered a counterpart to the Deny-Yosida approximation in Dirichlet form theory. Classical semigroup theory says that $\beta(w - \beta G_\beta w) \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow \infty} -Aw$ in $L^2(E, \nu)$ and therefore

$$S^{(\beta)}(w, w) = \beta \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta w, w \rangle \xrightarrow{\beta \rightarrow \infty} S(w, w), \quad w \in D(S).$$

and similarly $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} S_n^{(\beta)}(w_n, w_n) = S_n(w_n, w_n)$, $w_n \in D(S_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Differentiating with respect to β and applying the resolvent identity we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{d\beta} S_n^{(\beta)}(w_n, w_n) \right| &= \left| \frac{d}{d\beta} \beta \langle w_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} w_n, w_n \rangle_n \right| \\ &= \left| \langle w_n - 2\beta G_{n,\beta} w_n + \beta^2 G_{n,\beta}^2 w_n, w_n \rangle_n \right| \\ &= \left| \langle (A_n G_{n,\beta})^2 w_n, w_n \rangle_n \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \langle G_{n,\beta} A_n G_{n,\beta} w_n, A'_n w_n \rangle_n \right| \\
&= \left| \langle G_{n,\beta}^2 A_n w_n, A'_n w_n \rangle_n \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\beta^2} \langle A_n w_n, A_n w_n \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle A'_n w_n, A'_n w_n \rangle_n^{1/2}, \quad w_n \in D(S_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where, for the last three lines we have applied hypothesis (ii). It follows now from hypothesis (iii) that $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} S_n^{(\beta)}(w_n, w_n) = S_n(w_n, w_n)$ uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ whenever $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n \varphi_n, A_n \varphi_n \rangle_n < \infty$.

Step 2 Let us complete the verification of condition (i) of Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ and recall (c4). We can decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
S_n^{(\beta)}(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) - S^{(\beta)}(\varphi, \varphi) &= \beta \langle \varphi_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} \varphi_n, \varphi_n \rangle_n - \beta \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle \\
&= \beta \langle \varphi_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n + \beta \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi_n \rangle_n \\
&\quad - \beta \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n - \beta \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle \\
&\quad + \beta^2 \langle G_\beta \varphi - G_{n,\beta} \varphi - G'_{n,\beta} \varphi, \varphi_n - \varphi \rangle_n \\
&\quad + \beta \langle \varphi_n - \varphi - \beta G_{n,\beta}(\varphi_n - \varphi), \varphi_n - \varphi \rangle_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us analyze the items on the right-hand side.

- (1) $\langle \varphi_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle$ because of $\varphi_n - \beta G_{n,\beta} \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi$, cf. (i) of this proposition,
- (2) $\langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle$ because of $\varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ (cf. condition (c3) and Lemma 2.1 (b)) and $\varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi$,
- (3) $\langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi, \varphi \rangle$ because of condition (c3), Lemma 2.1 (b) and, thus, $\varphi - \beta G_\beta \varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, and Lemma 2.1 (d),
- (4) $\langle G_\beta \varphi - G_{n,\beta} \varphi - G'_{n,\beta} \varphi, \varphi_n - \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ because of $G_\beta \varphi - G_{n,\beta} \varphi - G'_{n,\beta} \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} -G'_\beta \varphi$ (cf. (i) of this proposition), $\varphi_n - \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} 0$, and Proposition 2.3 (c),
- (5) $\langle \varphi_n - \varphi - \beta G_{n,\beta}(\varphi_n - \varphi), \varphi_n - \varphi \rangle_n \geq 0$ because of Lemma 2.1 (b) in [14].

Therefore, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^{(\beta)}(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) \geq S^{(\beta)}(\varphi, \varphi)$, $\beta > 0$. With the result of Step 1, we get $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) \geq S(\varphi, \varphi)$ which, by condition (iii) of the present proposition and (c4), is condition (i) of Definition 2.4.

Step 3 Let us verify condition (ii) of Definition 2.4. Among others things, we will use an idea from the proof of [15], Theorem 2.4.1, part (jj). Let $\psi \in D(S)$ and recall that, because of (c4), we have $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$. According to $G_{n,\beta} \psi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta \psi$, we have $S_n^{(\beta)}(\psi, \psi) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} S^{(\beta)}(\psi, \psi)$, $\beta > 0$. On the other hand, it holds that $S^{(\beta)}(\psi, \psi) \xrightarrow[\beta \rightarrow \infty]{} S(\psi, \psi)$, cf. Step 1. Thus, there exists a sequence β_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\beta_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n^{(\beta_n)}(\psi, \psi) = S(\psi, \psi). \tag{2.8}$$

Because of

$$S_n^{(\beta_n)}(\psi, \psi) = S_n(\beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi) + \beta_n \langle \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi \rangle_n \quad (2.9)$$

and $S_n(\beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi) \geq 0$ it follows from (2.8) that

$$\langle \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad (2.10)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \varphi \rangle_n| &\leq \langle \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \psi - \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \psi$, and (2.10) provides

$$\beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi.$$

Relations (2.8) and (2.9) imply now

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n(\beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi, \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi) \leq S(\psi, \psi).$$

Choosing $\psi_n := \beta_n G_{n,\beta_n} \psi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, this verifies condition (ii) of Definition 2.4 for $\psi \in D(S)$. The case $\psi \notin D(S)$ is trivial.

Step 4 In order to verify condition (iii) of Definition 2.4, let $\beta > 0$, $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $u_n \in D(S_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a w -convergent sequence with the properties mentioned in Lemma 2.6 and $u \in D(S)$. We assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \psi_n) = S_\beta(u, \psi)$ for all sequences $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to ψ . Recalling hypothesis (i) it follows that for $g \in \mathcal{C}$, $\hat{\psi}_n := G'_{n,\beta} g$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{\psi} := G'_\beta g$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle u_n, g \rangle_n &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(u_n, \hat{\psi}_n) \\ &= S_\beta(u, \hat{\psi}) \\ &= \langle u, g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This means that u_n w -converges to u . For this, also note that because of condition (c3), $\hat{\psi}, \hat{\psi}_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let now $\psi \in D(S)$ and $\psi_n \in D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence s -convergent to ψ . Lemma 2.5 yields $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,\beta}(\psi_n, u_n) = S_\beta(\psi, u)$. $\square$

We conclude this subsection with the proof of s -convergence of the associated semigroups. For this, let us introduce the following condition.

(c5) $\mathcal{T} := \{T_t g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{T}_n := \{T_{n,t} g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{T}' := \{T'_t g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{T}'_n := \{T'_{n,t} g : g \in \mathcal{C}, \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in the sense of condition (c3).

Theorem 2.10 *Suppose that (c1), (c2), (c3), (c5) are satisfied. Then, for all $g \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\beta > 0$, $G_{n,\beta} g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$ and $G'_{n,\beta} g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G'_\beta g$ iff $T_{n,t} g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} T_t g$ and $T'_{n,t} g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T'_t g$.*

Proof. In Steps 1 and 2, we demonstrate that $G_{n,\beta}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$ implies $T_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} T_tg$ and $T'_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T'_tg$. In Step 3, we verify that $T_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} T_tg$ and $T'_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T'_tg$ implies $G_{n,\beta}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$ and $G'_{n,\beta}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G'_\beta g$.

Step 1 In this step, let us show that $T_{n,t}f \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T_tf$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$. Of course, then also $T'_{n,t}f \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T'_tf$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$. For well-definiteness, recall condition (c5). Since both, $\mathcal{C}$ and $D(A^2)$, are dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$ it is sufficient to verify this claim for $f = (G_\beta)^2h$, $h \in \mathcal{C}$. Set $g = G_\beta h$. With [16], Lemma 4.1 of Chapter 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_{n,t}f - T_tf, \varphi \rangle_n &= \langle T_{n,t}G_\beta g - T_tG_\beta g, \varphi \rangle_n \\ &= \langle T_{n,t}G_\beta g - T_{n,t}G_{n,\beta}g, \varphi \rangle_n + \langle G_{n,\beta}T_{n,t}g - G_{n,\beta}T_tg, \varphi \rangle_n + \langle G_{n,\beta}T_tg - G_\beta T_tg, \varphi \rangle_n \\ &= \langle T_{n,t}G_\beta g - T_{n,t}G_{n,\beta}g, \varphi \rangle_n - \left\langle \int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds, \varphi \right\rangle_n \\ &\quad + \langle G_{n,\beta}T_tg - G_\beta T_tg, \varphi \rangle_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the Schwarz inequality, (2.7), and contractivity of $T_{n,t}$ in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$ that the first item of the right-hand side tends to zero. That the third item of the right-hand side tends to zero is a consequence of the Schwarz inequality and (2.7). Thus, it remains to demonstrate that $\langle \int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. But using again Schwarz' inequality, and contractivity of all the $T_{n,t-s}$, this follows from

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\langle \int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds, \varphi \right\rangle_n \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^t \langle (G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h, (G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n^{1/2} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

condition (c5), relation (2.7), and dominated convergence.

Step 2 Now, let us prove that $T_{n,t}f \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} T_tf$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}$. Again, we choose $f = (G_\beta)^2h$ where $h \in \mathcal{C}$, set $g = G_\beta h$, and decompose

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n,t}f - T_tf &= (T_{n,t}G_\beta g - T_{n,t}G_{n,\beta}g) - \left(\int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds \right) + (G_{n,\beta}T_tg - G_\beta T_tg). \end{aligned}$$

That the $L^2(E, \nu_n)$ -norms of the first and the third item tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ follows from the contractivity of the semigroups and relation (2.7). The arguments used already in Step 1, (2.11), lead to

$$\left\langle \int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds, \int_0^t T_{n,t-s}(G_\beta - G_{n,\beta})T_s h ds \right\rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Step 3 This follows from $G_\beta f = \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} T_t f dt$, $G_{n,\beta} f = \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} T_{n,t} f dt$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in \mathcal{C}$, and dominated convergence. $\square$

Remark (7) As in Remark (6), it follows that

$$\langle T_{n,t}g - T_tg, T_{n,t}g - T_tg \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle T'_{n,t}g, T'_{n,t}g \rangle_n \geq \langle T'_tg, T'_tg \rangle$$

if $T_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} T_tg$ and $T'_{n,t}g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} T'_tg$, $g \in \mathcal{C}$.

2.3 Mosco Type Convergence of Non-Positive Non-Symmetric Forms

For the remainder of this section, let us drop the assumption that the semigroups $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are contractive. As a consequence, we cannot state positivity of the associated bilinear forms. We are interested in substitutes for Theorem 2.7. For this, we collect almost everything still necessary for the remainder of the section in the following condition.

- (c6) (i) $\mathbb{1} \in D(A')$ and $\mathbb{1} \in D(A'_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|A'_n \mathbb{1}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu_n)} < \infty$.
(ii) $T'_t \mathbb{1} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ and the limit $A' \mathbb{1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (T'_t \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1})$ exists in $L^\infty(E, \nu)$.
(iii) There exist $N_n \in \mathcal{B}(E_n)$ with $\nu_n(N_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ such that for $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ there is $\Phi_n \equiv \Phi_n(\varphi) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Phi_n = A'_n \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi$ on $E_n \setminus N_n$. Furthermore, $\Phi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi$. Alternatively assume $A'_n \mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $A'_n \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$.
(iv) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a set $D_n \subseteq D(S_n) \cap L^\infty(E, \nu_n)$ which is dense in $D(S_n)$ with respect to the norm $\|f\|_{D_n} := (\langle f, f \rangle_n + \langle A_n f, A_n f \rangle_n)^{1/2}$.

Define $D(\hat{S}_n) := D(S_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $D(\hat{S}) := D(S)$, and

$$\hat{S}_n(u_n, v_n) := S_n(u_n, v_n) + \frac{1}{2} \langle A'_n \mathbb{1} \cdot u_n, v_n \rangle_n, \quad u_n \in D(\hat{S}_n), \quad v_n \in L^2(E, \nu_n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\hat{S}(u, v) := S(u, v) + \frac{1}{2} \langle A' \mathbb{1} \cdot u, v \rangle, \quad u \in D(\hat{S}), \quad v \in L^2(E, \nu). \quad (2.13)$$

Lemma 2.11 *Suppose (c6). We have $\hat{S}_n(u_n, u_n) \geq 0$, $u_n \in D(S_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}(u, u) \geq 0$, $u \in D(S)$.*

Proof. Step 1 We prove the claim for $\hat{S}$. Note that $T'_t \mathbb{1} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ (cf. (c6(ii))) and observe

$$\|T_t u\|_{L^1(E, \nu)} \leq \|T_t |u|\|_{L^1(E, \nu)} = \langle T'_t \mathbb{1}, |u| \rangle, \quad u \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

This implies

$$\langle T_t u, T_t u \rangle \leq \|T_t u^2\|_{L^1(E, \nu)} \leq \int T'_t \mathbb{1} \cdot u^2 d\nu, \quad u \in L^2(E, \nu), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_t u, u \rangle &\leq \left(\int T'_t \mathbb{1} \cdot u^2 d\nu \right)^{1/2} \cdot \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2} \\ &= \langle u, u \rangle + \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2} \left(\left(\int T'_t \mathbb{1} \cdot u^2 d\nu \right)^{1/2} - \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$-\frac{\langle u, u \rangle^{1/2}}{\langle u, u \rangle^{1/2} + \left(\int T'_t \mathbb{1} \cdot u^2 d\nu \right)^{1/2}} \langle \frac{1}{t} (T'_t \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1}) u, u \rangle \leq \frac{1}{t} \langle u - T_t u, u \rangle, \quad u \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

Recalling $\mathbb{I} \in D(A')$ (cf. (c6(i))) and (c6(ii)), and letting $t \rightarrow 0$, it turns out that

$$-\frac{1}{2}\langle A'\mathbb{I} \cdot u, u \rangle \leq S(u, u), \quad u \in D(S).$$

Step 2 We prove the claim for $\hat{S}_n$. For this, we choose $u_n \in D_n$ (cf. (c6(iv))) and proceed as in Step 1. We arrive at

$$-\frac{\langle u_n, u_n \rangle_n^{1/2}}{\langle u_n, u_n \rangle_n^{1/2} + \left(\int T'_{n,t} \mathbb{I} \cdot u_n^2 d\boldsymbol{\nu}_n \right)^{1/2}} \langle \frac{1}{t} (T'_{n,t} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I}) u_n, u_n \rangle_n \leq \frac{1}{t} \langle u_n - T_{n,t} u_n, u_n \rangle_n.$$

Letting again $t \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $-\frac{1}{2}\langle A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot u_n, u_n \rangle \leq S(u_n, u_n)$ for all $u_n \in D_n$. Let us finally mention that, in contrast to Step 1, we do not require $T'_{n,t} \mathbb{I} \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$. We compensate this by requiring $u_n \in D_n \subseteq L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$. But with (c6(iv)), we get finally $-\frac{1}{2}\langle A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot u_n, u_n \rangle \leq S(u_n, u_n)$ for all $u_n \in D(S_n)$. $\square$

Let us assume that there are Markov processes associated with the semigroups $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X^n = ((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}, (P_\mu^n)_{\mu \in E_n})$ be a process taking values in E_n which corresponds to the semigroup $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ and the form S_n . Furthermore, let $X = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (P_\mu)_{\mu \in E})$ be a process associated with the semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the form S which takes values in some subset of E . Suppose that the paths of the processes X^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and X are cadlag. For $\beta > 0$, introduce $G_{n,\beta} g_n := \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} T_{n,t} g_n dt$, $g_n \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $G_\beta g := \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} T_t g dt$, $g \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. Since the semigroups $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are not necessarily contractive, the associated families of resolvents $(G_{n,\beta})_{\beta > 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(G_\beta)_{\beta > 0}$ may not directly be well-defined on the corresponding L^2 -spaces.

Set $D(\hat{A}_n) := D(A_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $D(\hat{A}) := D(A)$, and

$$\hat{A}_n u_n := A_n u_n - \frac{1}{2} A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot u_n, \quad u_n \in D(\hat{A}_n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\hat{A} u := A u - \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot u, \quad u \in D(\hat{A}). \quad (2.15)$$

Let id_n denote the identity operator in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let id denote the identity operator in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$.

Lemma 2.12 *Suppose (c6) and let $C := \frac{1}{2} \|A' \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} \vee \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2} \|A'_n \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)}$. (a) The operator $\hat{A}_n$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(\hat{T}_{t,n})_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the operator $\hat{A}$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(\hat{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. In addition, we have $\|\hat{T}_{t,n} g\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)} \leq e^{Ct} \|g\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)}$ if $g \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\|\hat{T}_t g\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} \leq e^{Ct} \|g\|_{L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})}$ if $g \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, $t \geq 0$. (b) Let $\alpha \geq C$. The operator $A_n - \alpha id_n$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_{\alpha,n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the operator $A - \alpha id$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_{\alpha,t})_{t \geq 0}$ in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$.*

Proof. Adapting the ideas of the proof of Lemma 2.11 we obtain for $u \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{t} (\langle T_t u, T_t u \rangle^{1/2} - \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2}) \\ & \leq \frac{\langle u, u \rangle^{1/2}}{\left(\int T'_t \mathbb{I} \cdot u^2 d\boldsymbol{\nu} \right)^{1/2} + \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{t} \left(\int T'_t \mathbb{I} \cdot u^2 d\boldsymbol{\nu} - \langle u, u \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

which results for $u = T_s v$, $v \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, $t \rightarrow 0$ in $\frac{d}{ds} \langle T_s v, T_s v \rangle^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|A' \mathbb{I}\| \langle T_s v, T_s v \rangle^{1/2}$, $s \geq 0$. This implies $\langle T_s v, T_s v \rangle^{1/2} \leq e^{\frac{1}{2} \|A' \mathbb{I}\| s} \langle v, v \rangle^{1/2}$, $v \in L^2(E, \nu)$, $s \geq 0$. Similarly, $\langle T_{n,s} v, T_{n,s} v \rangle^{1/2} \leq e^{\frac{1}{2} \|A'_n \mathbb{I}\| s} \langle v, v \rangle^{1/2}$, $v \in L^2(E, \nu_n)$, $s \geq 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(a) We prove the claim for $(\hat{T})_{t \geq 0}$. According to the Phillips-Lumer Theorem (cf. [16], Theorem I.4.3, or [18], Section IX.8) and our Lemma 2.11, it is sufficient to demonstrate that, for some $\hat{\alpha} > \|A' \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)}$ the range of $(\hat{\alpha} id - \hat{A})$ is $L^2(E, \nu)$. But this follows immediately from the Feynman-Kac formula,

$$u = \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^\infty \exp \left\{ -\hat{\alpha} t - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I}(X_s) ds \right\} v(X_t) dt \right) \quad (2.16)$$

($\mathbb{E}$ stands for the expectation) which represents the solution to

$$\hat{\alpha} u - \hat{A} u = \hat{\alpha} u - A u + \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot u = v, \quad v \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

We note that $u = G_{\hat{\alpha}}(v - \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot u) \in D(A)$ and that (2.16) corresponds to

$$\hat{T}_t v = \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I}(X_s) ds \right\} v(X_t) \right), \quad v \in L^2(E, \nu). \quad (2.17)$$

We get $\|\hat{T}_t g\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)} \leq e^{Ct} \|g\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)}$ if $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, $t \geq 0$, from (2.17) and condition (c6(i), (ii)).

(b) Keeping (2.16) and (2.17) in mind, this follows from similar considerations noting that, as a consequence Lemma 2.11, $S_{n,\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α are non-negative forms. $\square$

Remark (8) Another consequence of Lemma 2.12 is that, besides the definitions (2.12)-(2.15), $\hat{A}_n$, $\hat{S}_n$, $(\hat{T}_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{A}$, $\hat{S}$, $(\hat{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ are related as described in Section 1.

In addition, let $(\hat{G}_{n,\beta})_{\beta \geq 0}$, denote the resolvent associated with $\hat{A}_n$, $\hat{S}_n$, $(\hat{T}_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $(\hat{G}_\beta)_{\beta \geq 0}$, denote the resolvent associated with $\hat{A}$, $\hat{S}$, $(\hat{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

In order to handle the application in Section 4, it also seems to be beneficial to consider the following stronger condition in place of (c3) and the related Lemma 2.13.

- (c3') (i) If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq L^\infty(E, \nu)$ then $\{G_{\beta g} : g \in L^\infty(E, \nu), \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the sense that for every $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, there is a $u \in \mathcal{C}$ with $G_{\beta g} = u$ ν -a.e. Otherwise, $D(S) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.
- (ii) If, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq L^\infty(E, \nu_n)$ then $\{G_{n,\beta g} : g \in L^\infty(E, \nu_n), \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ in the sense that for every $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu_n)$, there is a $u \in \mathcal{C}$ with $G_{n,\beta g} = u$ ν_n -a.e. Otherwise, $D(S_n) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 2.13 Suppose (c6). (a) If (c3'(i)) then condition (c3(i)) holds for $\hat{S}$ in place of S . (b) If (c3'(ii)) then condition (c3(ii)) holds for $\hat{S}_n$, in place of S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We show (a). Let $\beta > 0$ and $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq L^\infty(E, \nu)$. Otherwise, let $g \in L^2(E, \nu)$. We have

$$\beta G_{\beta g} - A G_{\beta g} = g = \beta \hat{G}_\beta g - A \hat{G}_\beta g + \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \hat{G}_\beta g.$$

In addition, recall that $\hat{G}_\beta g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ if $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ which is a standard consequence of Lemma 2.12 (a). Because of $A'\mathbb{1} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ (cf. condition (c6(ii))), we have $g - \frac{1}{2}A'\mathbb{1} \cdot \hat{G}_\beta g \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq L^\infty(E, \nu)$, or otherwise $g - \frac{1}{2}A'\mathbb{1} \cdot \hat{G}_\beta g \in L^2(E, \nu)$. The last identity implies

$$\hat{G}_\beta g = G_\beta \left(g - \frac{1}{2}A'\mathbb{1} \cdot \hat{G}_\beta g \right).$$

Condition (c3'(i)) shows now $\hat{G}_\beta g \in \mathcal{C}$. Condition (c3(i)) relative to $\hat{S}$ is now a consequence of $D(\hat{S}) = D(\hat{A}) = \{\hat{G}_\beta g : g \in L^2(E, \nu)\}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.14 *Suppose (c1), (c2), and (c6). Furthermore, suppose (c3) for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$ in place of S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S . Assume that the forms $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converge to the form $\hat{S}$ in the sense of Definition 2.4. Let $C := \frac{1}{2}\|A'\mathbb{1}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)} \vee \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2}\|A'_n\mathbb{1}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu_n)}$.*

(a) *Let $\alpha \geq 2C$. Then the forms $S_{n, \alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converge to the form S_α in the sense of Definition 2.4.*

(b) *For all $f, g \in L^2(E, \nu)$, all sequences $f_n \in \mathcal{C}$ w -converging to f , all sequences $g_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to g , and all $\beta > 2C$, we have $\hat{G}_{n, \beta} f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \hat{G}_\beta f$, $\hat{G}'_{n, \beta} f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \hat{G}'_\beta f$ and $\hat{G}_{n, \beta} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \hat{G}_\beta g$.*

(c) *For $\beta > 2C$, the operators $G_{n, \beta}$ and G_β can be continuously extended to operators $G_{n, \beta} : L^2(E, \nu_n) \rightarrow L^2(E, \nu_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $G_\beta : L^2(E, \nu) \rightarrow L^2(E, \nu)$, respectively. For f, g, f_n, g_n as in (b) we have $G_{n, \beta} f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta f$, $G'_{n, \beta} f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G'_\beta f$ and $G_{n, \beta} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$.*

Remark (9) Recalling the proof of Theorem 2.7, especially Step 4, it will turn out that it is sufficient to require (c3(i)) and (c3(ii)) instead of (c3) for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$ if we are not interested in the convergence of $G'_{n, \beta}$.

Proof. In order to show part (a), in Step 1-3 below, we will verify conditions (i)-(iii) of Definition 2.4 for $S_{n, \alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α . In Step 4, we will verify (b) and (c).

Step 1 Let us use the symbols φ_n , φ , ψ_n , ψ , u_n , u , as in Definition 2.4 with S and S_n replaced with S_α and $S_{n, \alpha}$. Introduce $a_n := \alpha - \frac{1}{2}A'_n\mathbb{1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $a := \alpha - \frac{1}{2}A'\mathbb{1}$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$ (cf. Lemma 2.1 (c)), for given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\langle \varphi - \tilde{\varphi}, \varphi - \tilde{\varphi} \rangle < \varepsilon$. Let such ε and $\tilde{\varphi}$ be given. Condition (i) of Definition 2.4 for $S_{n, \alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α follows from

$$S_{n, \alpha}(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) = \hat{S}_n(\varphi_n, \varphi_n) + \langle a_n^{1/2} \varphi_n, a_n^{1/2} \varphi_n \rangle_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$S_\alpha(\varphi, \varphi) = \hat{S}(\varphi, \varphi) + \langle a^{1/2} \varphi, a^{1/2} \varphi \rangle,$$

condition (i) for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$, and

$$\langle a_n^{1/2} \varphi_n, a_n^{1/2} \varphi_n \rangle_n = \langle a_n^{1/2}(\varphi_n - \tilde{\varphi}), a_n^{1/2}(\varphi_n - \tilde{\varphi}) \rangle_n + 2\langle a_n \tilde{\varphi}, \varphi_n \rangle_n - \langle a_n \tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi} \rangle_n$$

together with condition (c6(i), (ii), (iii)) and Proposition 2.3 (c).

Step 2 Condition (ii) of Definition 2.4 for $S_{n, \alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α is an immediate consequence of (ii) for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$ together with condition (c6(i), (ii), (iii)). For the alternative use Lemma 2.1 (e) as well as Proposition 2.3 (g).

Step 3 In order to verify condition (iii) of Definition 2.4 for $S_{n, \alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α , let $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ and suppose $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n u_n, A_n u_n \rangle_n < \infty$ as well as

$$S_{n, \alpha + \tilde{\beta}}(u_n, \psi_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} S_{\alpha + \tilde{\beta}}(u, \psi).$$

Introducing $v_n := \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(-A_n u_n + (\alpha + \tilde{\beta})u_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $v := \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(-Au + (\alpha + \tilde{\beta})u)$, this means nothing but $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n v_n, A_n v_n \rangle_n < \infty$ as well as

$$\hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(v_n, \psi_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{S}_{\tilde{\beta}}(v, \psi). \quad (2.18)$$

Choosing here $\psi_n = \psi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and recalling Remark (2), we get $-\hat{A}_n v_n + \tilde{\beta} v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\hat{A}v + \tilde{\beta}v$. Lemma 2.8 implies $v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} v$. Let us conclude $u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u$ from this.

Let $\rho \in \mathcal{C}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(a_n \cdot u_n), \rho \rangle_n &= \langle \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(-A_n u_n + (\alpha + \tilde{\beta}) \cdot u_n), \rho \rangle_n \\ &= \langle v_n, \rho \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle v, \rho \rangle \\ &= \langle u + \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot u), \rho \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

On the other hand, let us assume that $u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}$ for some $\tilde{u} \in L^2(E, \nu)$. From condition (c6(i), (ii), (iii)) and Proposition 2.3 (c), (f) we obtain the existence of $\tilde{\Psi}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\tilde{\Psi}_n = a_n \cdot u_n$ on $E_n \setminus N_n$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} a \cdot \tilde{u}$. It follows from Theorem 2.7 (a) and the hypotheses of the present theorem that

$$\langle u_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(a_n \cdot u_n), \rho \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \tilde{u} + \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot \tilde{u}), \rho \rangle, \quad \rho \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (2.20)$$

According to (2.19) and (2.20), it holds that $\tilde{u} - u = -\hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot (\tilde{u} - u))$ which implies $\tilde{u} \in D(A)$ since $u \in D(A)$ by hypothesis and $\hat{A}(\tilde{u} - u) - \tilde{\beta}(\tilde{u} - u) = a \cdot (\tilde{u} - u)$. The latter implies

$$\langle -\hat{A}(\tilde{u} - u), \tilde{u} - u \rangle = \langle (A' \mathbb{I} - \alpha - \tilde{\beta})(\tilde{u} - u), \tilde{u} - u \rangle.$$

The left-hand side is non-negative by Lemma 2.11. Since $\alpha \geq \|A' \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)}$ it follows that $u = \tilde{u}$.

Together with the above derived relation $v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} v$ we now also have $u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u$. We recall that from condition (c6(i), (ii), (iii)) and Proposition 2.3 (c), (f) we obtain the existence of $\bar{\Psi}_n \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\bar{\Psi}_n = a_n \cdot u_n$ on $E_n \setminus N_n$ and $\bar{\Psi}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} a \cdot u$. Together with (2.18) and Proposition 2.3 (c), this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(u_n, \psi_n) &= \hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(v_n, \psi_n) - \langle a_n \cdot u_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{S}_{\tilde{\beta}}(v, \psi) - \langle a \cdot u, \psi \rangle \\ &= \hat{S}_{\tilde{\beta}}(u, \psi). \end{aligned}$$

Condition (iii) of Definition 2.4 for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$ implies now that

$$\hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\psi_n, u_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{S}_{\tilde{\beta}}(\psi, u). \quad (2.21)$$

Since (2.21) holds for arbitrary $D(S_n) \cap \mathcal{C} \ni \psi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi \in D(S)$, it is also true for ψ_n replaced with $\psi_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\Psi_n)$ and ψ replaced with $\psi + \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot \psi)$ where $\Psi_n \equiv \Psi_n(\psi) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\Psi_n = A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot \psi$ on $E_n \setminus N_n$ and E_n is as in (c6(iii)). For $\psi_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\Psi_n) \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, recall conditions (c6(iii)) and (c3) for $\hat{S}_n$ as well as $\hat{S}$, and Lemma 2.1 (e). For

$\psi_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\Psi_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi + \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot \psi)$, consult condition (c6(i), (ii), (iii)), Proposition 2.3 (g), and Theorem 2.7. From (2.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n,\alpha+\tilde{\beta}}(\psi_n, u_n) &= \hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\psi_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(a_n \cdot \psi_n), u_n) \\ &= \hat{S}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\psi_n + \hat{G}_{n,\tilde{\beta}}(\Psi_n), u_n) + \langle a_n \cdot \psi_n - \Psi_n, u_n \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \hat{S}_{\tilde{\beta}}(\psi + \hat{G}_{\tilde{\beta}}(a \cdot \psi), u) \\ &= S_{\alpha+\tilde{\beta}}(\psi, u); \end{aligned}$$

for $\langle a_n \cdot \psi_n - \Psi_n, u_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ we have already mentioned that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle u_n, u_n \rangle_n < \infty$. Thus, we have (iii) for $S_{n,\alpha}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S_α . Part (a) has been verified.

Step 4 Part (b) is a corollary of the Lemmas 2.11 and 2.12 (a) and Theorem 2.7. For part (c), let $\beta > 2C$ and recall Lemma 2.12 (b). It follows from Part (a) of the present theorem and from Theorem 2.7, that $G_{n,\beta}f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G_\beta f$, $G'_{n,\beta}f_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} G'_\beta f$, and $G_{n,\beta}g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g$. $\square$

3 Relative Compactness

In this section, we specify the setting of Section 2. For this, let $\mathcal{M}_1(\overline{D})$ denote the space of all probability measures on $(\overline{D}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{D}))$ where D is a bounded d -dimensional domain or, more general, a bounded d -dimensional Riemannian manifold for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, let $\mathcal{M}_\partial(\overline{D})$ be the quotient set of $\mathcal{M}_1(\overline{D})$ with respect to measures on the boundary ∂D , that is the set of all equivalence classes μ such that $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mu$ implies $\nu_1|_D = \nu_2|_D$. Let both spaces $\mathcal{M}_1(\overline{D})$ and $\mathcal{M}_\partial(\overline{D})$ be endowed with the Prohorov metric.

In particular, we will assume that E is one of the compact spaces $\mathcal{M}_1(\overline{D})$ or $\mathcal{M}_\partial(\overline{D})$. Note that in the case of $E = \mathcal{M}_\partial(\overline{D})$, we identify all points belonging to ∂D with each other. Furthermore, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let E'_n be the set of all measures μ in E of the form $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i}$ where $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \overline{D}$ and δ_z denotes the Dirac measure concentrated at z . Furthermore, let $E_0 := E$, $E_1 := E'_1$ and $E_{n+1} := E'_{n+1} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. According to the basic setting of Subsection 2.1 E_n and E'_n differ by ν_n -zero set, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is therefore reasonable to *identify* $L^p(E, \nu_n)$ with both $L^p(E_n, \nu_n)$ and $L^p(E'_n, \nu_n)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

To be consistent with [14], we will keep on writing $C_b(E)$ for $C(E)$. Choose $\mathcal{F} := C_b(E)$ and note that therefore $\mathcal{C}$ is now the space of all functions $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying the following.

(c1') φ is bounded and continuous on E_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(c2') $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle$ for all $\psi \in C_b(E)$.

Obviously, $\mathcal{F}$ is dense in $L^2(E, \nu)$. Under the above choice of $\mathcal{F}$, compatibility with Section 2 and well-definiteness of $\mathcal{C}$ is subject to the subsequent.

Proposition 3.1 $\mathcal{F} = C_b(E)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the measures ν_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are weakly convergent to ν as $n \rightarrow \infty$; in symbols $\nu_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \nu$.

Let us assume that $\nu_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \nu$ and note that (c1') and (c2') are now the defining properties of $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$.

As in Section 2, let us assume that there are Markov processes X^n and X associated with the semigroups $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

Define the measures $P_{\nu_n} := \int_E P_\mu^n \nu_n(d\mu)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $P_\nu := \int_E P_\mu(\mu) \nu(d\mu)$, and introduce the processes $\mathbf{X}^n = ((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n})$ and $\mathbf{X} = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, P_\nu)$. Moreover, let $\mathbb{E}_\mu^n$ be the expectation corresponding to P_μ^n , $\mu \in E_n$, and let $\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}$ be the expectation corresponding to P_{ν_n} , $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us introduce the set of test functions we are going to work with in this section. Suppose the following.

- (c7) There exists an algebra $\tilde{C}_b(E) \subseteq C_b(E)$ of everywhere on E defined functions with $\tilde{C}_b(E) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ in the sense that, for every $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, there is a $g \equiv g(f) \in \mathcal{C}$ and a $\beta > 0$ with $f = \beta G_{\beta} g$ ν -a.e. $\tilde{C}_b(E)$ contains the constant functions and separates points in E .

Remark (1) Note that, for $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, the existence of one $g \equiv g(f) \in \mathcal{C}$ and one $\beta > 0$ such that $f = \beta G_{\beta} g$ ν -a.e. implies that, for all $\beta' > 0$, there is a $g' \equiv g'(f, \beta') \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $f = \beta' G_{\beta'} g'$ ν -a.e. This follows from $g' := g + (\beta' - \beta)f = (g + Af - \beta f) - (Af - \beta' f)$.

For $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, $g = g(f) \in \mathcal{C}$, and a given sequence $\varepsilon_n > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, introduce

$$B := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\mu \in E_n : |\beta G_{n,\beta} g(\mu) - f(\mu)| \geq \varepsilon_n \|g\|\} . \quad (3.1)$$

Furthermore, let $\tau_{B^c} \equiv \tau_{B^c}^n(g)$ denote the first exit time of $\mathbf{X}^n$ from the set $B^c \cap E_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $T > 0$ and set

$$\gamma_n \equiv \gamma_n(f) := \sup_{s \in [0, T+1]} |\beta G_{n,\beta} g(X_s^n) - f(X_s^n)| , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In order to prove relative compactness of the families of processes $f(\mathbf{X}^n) = ((f(X_t^n))_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n} \circ f^{-1})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we need one more technical condition. In particular, we specify the sequence $\varepsilon_n > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (c8) There is a function $\xi : (0, \infty) \times \tilde{C}_b(E) \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi(a_n, f, n) = 0$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ such that, for $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, $g \equiv g(f)$, and $\varepsilon_n := \xi(\langle f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g, f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g \rangle_n^{1/2}, f, n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (e^{-\beta \tau_{B^c}}) \leq \delta_n , \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some sequence $\delta_n > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$ whenever $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$.

Theorem 3.2 (a) *Let the following be satisfied:*

(i) *Conditions (c3), (c7), and (c8) hold.*

(ii) *We have the hypotheses of Theorem 2.14, namely*

(c3) *for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\hat{S}$ in place of S_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S ,*
(c6),

the forms $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, converge to the form $\hat{S}$ in the sense of Definition 2.4.

Then, for $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, the family of processes $f(\mathbf{X}^n) = ((f(X_t^n))_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n} \circ f^{-1})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is relatively compact.

(b) The family of processes $\mathbf{X}^n = ((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is relatively compact.

Proof. (a) We will apply Theorem 3.8.6 of S.N. Ethier, T. Kurtz [7]. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_t^n$ denote the σ -algebra generated by the family $(X_s^n)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$. In Steps 1 and 2 below, we will keep $n \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed. In Step 3, we will then pass to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 1 Let $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$ and $\beta > 0$. Because of (c7) and Remark (1), there exist $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $f^2 = \beta G_{\beta} g_1$ ν -a.e. and $f = \beta G_{\beta} g_2$ ν -a.e. For $0 < \delta < 1$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$, $0 \leq u \leq \delta$, and $\beta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[(f(X_{t+u}^n) - f(X_t^n))^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[(f(X_{t+u}^n))^2 - (f(X_t^n))^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] - 2f(X_t^n) \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [f(X_{t+u}^n) - f(X_t^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [f^2(X_{t+u}^n) - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_{t+u}^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_{t+u}^n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_t^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_t^n) - f^2(X_t^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| \\
&\quad + 2\|f\| \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [f(X_{t+u}^n) - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_{t+u}^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| + 2\|f\| \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_{t+u}^n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_t^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| + 2\|f\| \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_t^n) - f(X_t^n) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] \right| \\
&\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T+1]} \left| \beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_s^n) - f^2(X_s^n) \right| \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \int_r^{r+\delta} |A_n(\beta G_{n,\beta} g_1)(X_s^n)| ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&\quad + 4\|f\| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{s \in [0, T+1]} \left| \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_s^n) - f(X_s^n) \right| \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&\quad + 2\|f\| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \int_r^{r+\delta} |A_n(\beta G_{n,\beta} g_2)(X_s^n)| ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\gamma_n(f^2) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \beta \int_r^{r+\delta} |g_1(X_s^n) - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_1(X_s^n)| ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&\quad + 4\|f\| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\gamma_n(f) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] + 2\|f\| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[\sup_{r \in [0, T]} \beta \int_r^{r+\delta} |g_2(X_s^n) - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2(X_s^n)| ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \\
&\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\gamma_n(f^2) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] + 2\beta\delta\|g_1\| + 4\|f\| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\gamma_n(f) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^n] + 4\beta\delta\|f\|\|g_2\|. \tag{3.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2 With $\tau_{B^c} \equiv \tau_{B^c}^n(g_2)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \gamma_n(f) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (\chi_{\{\gamma_n \leq \varepsilon_n \|g_2\|\}} \gamma_n(f)) + \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (\chi_{\{\gamma_n > \varepsilon_n \|g_2\|\}} \gamma_n(f))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \varepsilon_n \|g_2\| + (\|f\| + \|g_2\|) \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (\chi_{\{\gamma_n > \varepsilon_n \|g_2\|\}}) \\
&= \varepsilon_n \|g_2\| + (\|f\| + \|g_2\|) e^{\beta(T+1)} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (e^{-\beta(T+1)} \chi_{\{\gamma_n > \varepsilon_n \|g_2\|\}}) \\
&\leq \varepsilon_n \|g_2\| + (\|f\| + \|g_2\|) e^{\beta(T+1)} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} (e^{-\beta\tau_{B^c}} \chi_{\{\gamma_n > \varepsilon_n \|g_2\|\}}) \\
&\leq \varepsilon_n \|g_2\| + \delta_n (\|f\| + \|g_2\|) e^{\beta(T+1)}, \tag{3.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is justified by condition (c8). It follows now from $f = \beta G_\beta g_2$ ν -a.e. and $f - \beta G_\beta g_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ (cf. (c3) and (c7)) that $\langle f - \beta G_\beta g_2, f - \beta G_\beta g_2 \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Together with $G_{n,\beta} g_2 \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} G_\beta g_2$ (cf. Theorem 2.14 (c)), this leads to

$$\langle f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2, f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g_2 \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Relation (3.3) and condition (c8) imply now

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \gamma_n(f) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{and similarly} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \gamma_n(f^2) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Step 3 Setting

$$\gamma_n(\delta) := 2\gamma_n(f^2) + 4\|f\|\gamma_n(f) + 2\beta\delta\|g_1\| + 4\beta\delta\|f\|\|g_2\|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and taking into consideration (3.2), we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} \left[(f(X_{t+u}^n) - f(X_t^n))^2 | \mathcal{F}_t^n \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} [\gamma_n(\delta) | \mathcal{F}_t^n], \quad f \in \tilde{C}_b(E), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and from (3.4), we obtain

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n}(\delta) = 0.$$

Relative compactness of the family $f(\mathbf{X}^n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, follows now from [7], Theorems 3.7.2 and 3.8.6, Remark 3.8.7, and the fact that the processes $f(\mathbf{X}^n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, take values in the compact interval $[\inf f, \sup f]$.

(b) Let us recall that E is compact. According to condition (c7), the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, implies that $\tilde{C}_b(E)$ is dense in $C_b(E)$ with respect to the sup-norm. Now the claim is a consequence of part (a) and [7], Theorem 3.9.1. $\square$

4 A Fleming-Viot Type Particle System

We consider a system $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ of n particles in a bounded d -dimensional domain D ($d \geq 2$) with smooth boundary ∂D . During periods none of the particles $X_1, \dots, X_n$ hit the boundary ∂D , the system behaves like n independent d -dimensional Brownian motions. When one of the particles hits the boundary ∂D , then it instantaneously jumps back to D and relocates according to a probability distribution ηdx on $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$. The probability distribution ηdx depends on the location of the remaining $n - 1$ particles in a way that relocation is more likely close to one of those particles than elsewhere. Similar models have been investigated in [1],[2],[8],[13].

We are interested in establishing relative compactness for a class of random initial configurations using the framework of Sections 2 and 3.

Let F denote the space of all finite signed measures on $\overline{D}$. Set $E := \mathcal{M}_\partial(\overline{D})$, recall the definition of E_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in Section 3.

4.1 A Non-Random Flow

Let us use the notation $(h, \nu) = \int h d\nu$, $\nu \in F$, $h \in L^1(\overline{D}, \nu)$. Let $h_1, h_2, \dots$ denote eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacian on D corresponding to the eigenvalues $0 > 2\lambda_1 \geq 2\lambda_2 \geq \dots$, normalized in $L^2(D)$ such that $h_1 > 0$. Define the space

$$H = \left\{ h dx \in F : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^2 \cdot (h_n, h)_{L^2(D)}^2 < \infty \right\}$$

which becomes a Hilbert space with the norm $\|h dx\|_H = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^2 \cdot (h_n, h)_{L^2(D)}^2 \right)^{1/2}$, $h \in H$. Subsequently, we will also write $h \in H$ instead of $h dx \in H$ when there is no risk of ambiguity.

Denote by $p(t, x, y)$, $t \geq 0$, $x, y \in D$, the transition density function of a Brownian motion on D killed when hitting ∂D . For $\nu \equiv \nu_0 \in H$ with $\nu(D) \neq 0$ and $t \geq 0$, set

$$u(t, y) := \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) \nu(dx), \quad z(t) \equiv z(\nu, t) := \frac{1}{\nu(D)} \int_{y \in D} u(t, y) dy.$$

If $\nu(D) = 0$ then we set $z(\nu, 0) := 1$. Otherwise, we have $z(\nu, 0) = 1$ in the sense of an integral over a δ -function. For $t \geq 0$ such that $z(t) \neq 0$ define

$$v(t, y) := \frac{1}{z(t)} u(t, y), \quad y \in D,$$

and

$$\nu_t(dy) := v(t, y) dy = \frac{1}{z(t)} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) \nu(dx) dy. \quad (4.1)$$

We observe that for $t \geq 0$ such that $z(t) \neq 0$ and $y \in D$, $v(t, y)$, satisfies

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} v(t, x) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta v(t, x) - \frac{z'(t)}{z(t)} v(t, x), \quad v(t, x)|_{x \in \partial D} = 0, \quad v(t, x) dx \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} \nu, \quad (4.2)$$

where Δ is the Laplace operator on D . In particular we mention that, for $t = 0$, $z'(0)$ is the right derivative.

Remark (1) Let $t \geq 0$ and $\nu \in H$. Note that

$$\nu_t(dy) = (z(\nu, t))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_j t} (h_j, \nu) h_j dy.$$

Among other things this shows that $\nu \rightarrow \nu_t$ maps $E \cap H$ into $E \cap H$ and, more general, $\nu_t \in H$ whenever $\nu \in H$ and $z(\nu, t) \neq 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_t(dy) &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_j t} (h_j, \nu) h_j dy}{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_j t} (h_j, \nu) (h_j, 1)} \\ &= \frac{(h_1, \nu) h_1 dy + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} e^{(\lambda_j - \lambda_1)t} (h_j, \nu) h_j dy}{(h_1, \nu) (h_1, 1) + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} e^{(\lambda_j - \lambda_1)t} (h_j, \nu) (h_j, 1)} \\ &\xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{h_1 dy}{(h_1, 1)}, \quad \nu \in E \cap H. \end{aligned}$$

The evolution of the infinite particle system is hence asymptotically directed to the inner point $h_1(x) dx / (h_1, 1)$ of E in the weak topology.

For ν_t defined in (4.1), one easily checks $(\nu_t)_s = \nu_{s+t}$, $s, t \geq 0$, $\nu \in E \cap H$. This gives rise to define a flow $U_t^+ \nu := \nu_t$, $t \geq 0$, where $\nu \in E \cap H$. In particular, we will be interested in integration by parts relative to the flow U_t^+ , $t \geq 0$, and the probability measures ν on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$. Crucial in this will be the generator A^f of U^+ and its divergence $\delta(A^f)$ with respect to measures ν . The superscript f in A^f indicates the generator of the flow associated with (4.2). Below, in contrast, A will denote the generator of the semigroup associated with (4.2) on the state space E .

Remarks (2) For all $\nu \in H$, we may assume the existence of a density $d = \frac{d\nu}{dx}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure such that $\frac{1}{2}\Delta d = \sum \lambda_i(h_i, d)_{L^2(D)} h_i$ is well-defined in $L^2(D)$. We also will write $\Delta\nu$ for $\Delta d dx$.

(3) Let $|D|$ denote the Lebesgue measure of D . For $\nu = d dx \in H$ it follows now that

$$\begin{aligned} z'(0) \equiv z'(\nu, 0) &= \frac{1}{\nu(D)} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{y \in D} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) \nu(dx) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu(D)} \int_{y \in D} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) d(x) dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu(D)} \int_{y \in D} \frac{1}{2} (\Delta d)(y) dy \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|D|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\nu(D)} \|\Delta d\|_{L^2(D)} < \infty \end{aligned}$$

where the interchange of $\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0}$ and $\int_{y \in D}$ in the second line applies because the derivative $\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, \cdot) d(x) dx$ is a limit in $L^2(D)$ and $\int_{y \in D} \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) d(x) dx dy$ is the inner product of this limit with $1 \in L^2(D)$. Recalling how (4.2) has been established we now observe that the limit $A^f \nu = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \nu_t$ exists in $L^2(D)$.

Let $C_b^{q,1}(F, E)$, $q \in [1, \infty]$, denote the set of all bounded and continuous functions $f : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which

(i) for all $h \in L^2(D)$ the directional derivative

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial h}(\nu) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} (f(\nu + th dx) - f(\nu))$$

exists for ν -a.e. $\nu \in E$,

(ii) a measurable map $Df : E \rightarrow L^2(D)$ exists such that

$$(Df(\nu), h) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial h}(\nu) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } \nu \in E,$$

(iii) and $Df \in L^q(E, \nu; L^2(D))$.

Define $C_b^{q,1}(E) := \{f|_E : f \in C_b^{q,1}(F, E)\}$, $q \in [1, \infty]$. For $f \in C_b^1(E)$ we call Df the *gradient* of f . Introduce also

$$\tilde{C}_b^2(E) := \left\{ f(\nu) = \varphi((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu)), \nu \in E : \varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^r), r \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Let $C_0^2(\mathbb{R})$ denote the set of all $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ which have compact support. Furthermore define K to be the set of all non-negative $k \in C(D) \cap L^2(D)$ such that $\lim_{D \ni u \rightarrow v} k(u) = \infty$, $v \in \partial D$.

$$\tilde{C}_0^2(E) := \left\{ f(\nu) = \varphi((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu)) \cdot \varphi_0((k, \nu)), \nu \in E : \right. \\ \left. \varphi \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^r), r \in \mathbb{N}, \varphi_0 \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}), k \in K \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Remarks (4) Let us note that any function $f(\nu)$, ν belonging to E has a formal representation $f(\nu) = \varphi((h_1, \nu), (h_2, \nu), \dots)$. For this, recall that the linear hull with respect to the sup-norm of $h_1, h_2, \dots$ is $C_0(D) := \{f \in C_b(D) : f = 0 \text{ on } \partial D \text{ in the sense that } \lim_{D \ni x \rightarrow d} f(x) = 0, d \in \partial D\}$. This implies that every $\nu \in E$ is uniquely determined by $(h_1, \nu), (h_2, \nu), \dots$.

(5) Obviously, $\tilde{C}_b^2(E) \subseteq C_b^{1,\infty}(E)$ and for f and φ as in (4.3), the gradient of f is given by

$$Df(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu)) h_i. \quad (4.5)$$

(6) Keeping relation (4.2) in mind, we obtain the following representations of the generator $A^f : H \rightarrow L^2(D)$ of U^+ . We have

$$A^f \nu = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \nu_t = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \nu - z'(0) \nu \\ = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\lambda_i - \frac{\int \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j (h_j, \nu) h_j dx}{\int \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (h_j, \nu) h_j dx} \right) (h_i, \nu) \cdot h_i dx \quad (4.6)$$

which by Remark (3) exists for every $\nu \in H$ in $L^2(D)$.

4.2 Integration by Parts on E

Let ν be a probability measure on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$. In order to establish integration by parts relative to the flow U^+ , we will first prove an absolute continuity result relative to ν under the flow U^+ .

Suppose that

(j) for $H(t) := \{\nu_t : \nu \in E \cap H\}$ we have $\nu(H(t)) = 1$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$.

It follows in particular that for ν -a.e. ν and $0 \leq s \leq 1$ there is an element $\nu_{-s} \in E \cap H$ such that $(\nu_{-s})_s = \nu$ and the measure $\nu \circ \nu_{-s}$ is well-defined by

$$\nu \circ \nu_{-s}(A) := \nu(\{\nu : \nu_s \in A\}), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(E) \cap H(s).$$

Suppose also the following.

(jj) There exists $q > 1$ such that

$$(z(\cdot, t))^{-2} \in L^q(E, \nu), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

and with $1/p + 1/q = 1$

$$A^f \in L^p(E, \nu; L^2(D)).$$

(jjj) For p and q given by (jj) and all vector fields B belonging to some dense subset of $L^p(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}; L^2(D))$ containing A^f , there exists a constant $c_p(B) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int (Df, B) d\boldsymbol{\nu} \right| \leq c_p(B) \cdot \|f\|_{L^q(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})}, \quad f \in C_b^{q,1}(E).$$

In this case for all $q > 1$ the gradient $(D, C_b^{q,1}(E))$ is closable on $L^q(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ and has a closure which we denote by $(D, D_{q,1}(E))$. Furthermore, there exists the *divergence* $\delta(B) \in L^p(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ of the vector field B relative to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and the gradient D , and we have

$$\int (Df, B) d\boldsymbol{\nu} = - \int f \delta(B) d\boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad f \in D_{q,1}(E).$$

(jv)

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\nu \in E \cap H} -\delta(A^f)(\nu) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(A^f) \in L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$$

where the essential supremum is relative to the measure $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

Stronger than (jv) is

(jv')

$$\delta(A^f) \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}).$$

Proposition 4.1 *Assume (j)-(jv). (a) All measures $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, are equivalent, note that $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_0 = \boldsymbol{\nu}$. The Radon-Nikodym derivatives have a version such that*

$$[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow r_{-t} := \frac{d\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\boldsymbol{\nu}}$$

is $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ -a.e. absolutely continuous on $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))$. We have

$$r_{-t}(\nu) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \quad \boldsymbol{\nu}\text{-a.e.}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1. \quad (4.7)$$

(b) For $f \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \bigg|_{t=0} \int f(\nu_t) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu) = - \int f(\nu) \delta(A^f)(\nu) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu).$$

Proof. (a) *Step 1* In this step we verify that for $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ we have $f \circ \nu_t \in C_b^{q,1}(E)$ and we determine the gradient of $f \circ \nu_t$. Let $\nu \in E \cap H$ and recall Remarks (1)-(3). For this step take also into consideration that $\frac{d}{dt}(\nu_t, h_i) = (\frac{d}{dt}\nu_t, h_i)$ since the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}\nu_t$ exists for all $\nu \in E \cap H$ in $L^2(D)$.

We observe that by (4.1) and (4.6)

$$\frac{d}{du} \bigg|_{u=0} (\nu + u \cdot A^f \nu)_t(dy) = \frac{d}{du} \bigg|_{u=0} \frac{\int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) (\nu(dx) + u \cdot A^f \nu(dx)) dy}{z(\nu + u \cdot A^f \nu, t)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) A^f \nu(dx) dy}{z(\nu, t)} - \frac{\int_{y \in D} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) A^f \nu(dx) dy}{z(\nu, t)} \cdot \nu_t(dy) \\
&= \frac{\int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \nu(dx) - z'(\nu, 0) \nu(dx) \right) dy}{z(\nu, t)} \\
&\quad - \frac{\int_{y \in D} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \nu(dx) - z'(\nu, 0) \nu(dx) \right) dy}{z(\nu, t)} \cdot \nu_t(dy) \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{2} \Delta u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t)} - z'(\nu, 0) \cdot \frac{u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t)} - \left(\frac{\int_{y \in D} \frac{1}{2} \Delta u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t)} - z'(\nu, 0) \right) \cdot \nu_t(dy) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\frac{u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t)} \right) - \frac{\int_{y \in D} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t)} \cdot \nu_t(dy) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \Delta \nu_t(dy) - z'(\nu_t, 0) \cdot \nu_t(dy) = A^f \nu_t(dy)
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last line, the “ ’ ” denotes the derivative with respect to the second argument of z and we have used the fact that

$$\frac{\int_{y \in D} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, y) dy}{z(\nu, t) \cdot \nu(D)} = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \big|_{s=0} \int_{y \in D} u(t+s, y) dy}{\int_{y \in D} u(t, y) dy} = z'(\nu_t, 0).$$

Let $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and φ be related to f as in (4.3) and define

$$f^F(\nu) := \varphi((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu)), \quad \nu \in F.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} f(\nu_t) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu_t), \dots, (h_r, \nu_t)) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}(\nu_t, h_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu_t), \dots, (h_r, \nu_t)) \cdot (A^f \nu_t, h_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu_t), \dots, (h_r, \nu_t)) \cdot \frac{d}{du} \bigg|_{u=0} ((\nu + u \cdot A^f \nu)_t, h_i) \\
&= \frac{d}{du} \bigg|_{u=0} f^F((\nu + u \cdot A^f \nu)_t). \tag{4.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we get for $h \in L^2(D)$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{du} \bigg|_{u=0} ((\nu + u \cdot h dx)_t, h_i) \\
&= \frac{\int_{y \in D} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) h(x) h_i(y) dx dy}{z(\nu, t)} - \frac{\int_{y \in D} \int_{x \in D} p(t, x, y) h(x) dx dy}{z(\nu, t)} \cdot (\nu_t, h_i) \\
&\quad + (\nu_t, h_i) \cdot (h, \mathbb{1}) \\
&= \left(\frac{\int_{y \in D} p(t, \cdot, y) h_i(y) dy}{z(\nu, t)}, h \right) - \left(\frac{e^{\lambda_i t}(h_i, \nu) \cdot \int_{y \in D} p(t, \cdot, y) dy}{(z(\nu, t))^2}, h \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{e^{\lambda_i t}(h_i, \nu)}{z(\nu, t)} \mathbb{1}, h \right) \\
& =: (r(\nu, t, i), h)
\end{aligned}$$

where because of (jj)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|r(\cdot, t, i)\|_{L^q(E, \nu; L^2(D))} \\
& \leq 3\|h_i\| \cdot |D| \vee |D|^{-1} \cdot \|(z(\cdot, t))^{-2}\|_{L^q(E, \nu)}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

with $q > 1$ given in (jj). The last two relations imply with

$$\left. \frac{d}{du} \right|_{u=0} f^F((\nu + u \cdot h \, dx)_t) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu_t), \dots, (h_r, \nu_t)) \cdot (r(\nu, t, i), h)$$

and

$$D(f^F \circ \nu_t)(\nu) \equiv D(f \circ \nu_t)(\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}((h_1, \nu_t), \dots, (h_r, \nu_t)) \cdot r(\nu, t, i)$$

for all $\nu \in E \cap H$ the estimation

$$\|D(f \circ \nu_t)\|_{L^q(E, \nu; L^2(D))} \leq 3|D| \vee |D|^{-1} \cdot \|(z(\cdot, t))^{-2}\|_{L^q(E, \nu)} \sum_{i=1}^r \|h_i\| \cdot \left\| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \right\| < \infty \quad (4.9)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$. In other words, $f^F \circ \nu_t \equiv f^F \circ \nu_t(\cdot) \in C_b^{q,1}(F, E)$ and thus

$$f \circ \nu_t \equiv f \circ \nu_t(\cdot) \in C_b^{q,1}(E), \quad f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E),$$

with $q > 1$ given in condition (jj).

Step 2 We derive an equation for the measure valued function $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow \nu \circ \nu_{-t}$ with initial value ν . For this, we follow an idea outlined in the proof of Theorem 9.2.4 in [3]. We also demonstrate in this step that the measures $\nu \circ \nu_{-t}$ and ν are equivalent.

Together with conditions (jj) and (jjj) relations (4.8) and (4.9) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \int f(\nu_t) \nu(d\nu) &= \int \frac{d}{dt} f(\nu_t) \nu(d\nu) \\
&= \int \left. \frac{d}{du} \right|_{u=0} f((\nu + u \cdot A^f \nu)_t) \nu(d\nu) \\
&= \int (D(f \circ \nu_t), A^f \nu) \nu(d\nu) \\
&= - \int f(\nu_t) \delta(A^f)(\nu) \nu(d\nu), \quad f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E);
\end{aligned}$$

where we in particular recall that the interchange of $\int$ and $\frac{d}{dt}$ in the first line is justified by the fact that the derivative (4.8), exists by (jj) and (4.9) in $L^1(E, \nu)$. Recalling that we have $\nu(\{\nu_t : \nu \in E \cap H\}) = 1$ by condition (j), from the last relation we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int f(\nu) \nu(d\nu_{-t}) = - \int f(\nu) \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-t}) \nu(d\nu_{-t}) \quad (4.10)$$

for all $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and with $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, 1])$

$$\int f(\nu) \int_{t=0}^1 \psi'(t) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu_{-t}) dt = \int_{t=0}^1 \psi(t) \int f(\nu) \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-t}) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu_{-t}) dt. \quad (4.11)$$

Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ and set

$$a(t, B) := \begin{cases} \frac{-\int_B \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-t}) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu_{-t})}{\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B)} & \text{if } \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu_{-t})(B) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (4.12)$$

We obtain from (4.11) and (4.12)

$$-\int_{t=0}^1 \psi'(t) \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B) dt = \int_{t=0}^1 \psi(t) a(t, B) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B) dt$$

and therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B) = \exp \left\{ \int_{s=0}^t a(s, B) ds \right\} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}(B), \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (4.13)$$

Condition (jv) together with (4.12) implies

$$a(s, B) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\nu \in E \cap H} -\delta(A^f)(\nu), \quad s \in [0, 1], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(E). \quad (4.14)$$

In other words, (4.13) says that the measure $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

Step 3 We show the well-definiteness of $\frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ as a finite signed measure on $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$.

From (4.13) it follows that $\frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B)$ exists for $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$. To verify the σ -additivity of $\frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$, let $B_1, B_2, \dots$ be a sequence of disjoint elements of $\mathcal{B}(E)$. The σ -additivity of $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} (\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t-h}(B_i) - \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B_i)) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t-h}(B_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B_i) \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left(\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t-h} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \right) - \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the interchange of limes and infinite sum in the second line is due to dominated convergence relative to the counting measure and the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{h} |\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t-h}(B_i) - \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B_i)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{h} \left| \exp \left\{ \int_{s=0}^{t+h} a(s, B) ds \right\} - \exp \left\{ \int_{s=0}^t a(s, B) ds \right\} \right| \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}(B_i) \\ &\leq \|\delta(A^f) \cdot \exp \{-\delta(A^f)\}\| \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}(B_i), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norm in $L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, which we have derived from (4.13) and (4.14). We note again that $\|\delta(A^f) \cdot \exp\{-\delta(A^f)\}\|$ is finite because of condition (jv).

Step 4 In this step we construct the versions r_{-t} of the Radon-Nikodym derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ such that

$$[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow r_{-t} = \frac{d\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\boldsymbol{\nu}}$$

is $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ -a.e. absolutely continuous on $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))$.

From (4.13) we deduce also the absolute continuity of $\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$. Because of (4.15) for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we may select

$$\text{a version } \rho_{-t} \text{ of the Radon-Nikodym derivative } \frac{d\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\boldsymbol{\nu}}$$

with

$$\rho_{-t}(\nu) \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\nu \in E \cap H} |\delta(A^f)(\nu) \cdot \exp\{-\delta(A^f)(\nu)\}| \quad \nu \in E \cap H. \quad (4.16)$$

With this version we can define

$$r_{-t} := \int_0^t \rho_{-s} ds + 1, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (4.17)$$

We obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_B r_{-t} d\boldsymbol{\nu} = \int_B \rho_{-t} d\boldsymbol{\nu} = \frac{d}{dt} \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B)$$

and thus

$$\int_B r_{-t} d\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}(B), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}(E).$$

This means that, for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the function r_{-t} is a version of the of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

Step 5 From (4.16) and (4.17) it follows that, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, the signed measure $\frac{d}{dt}\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}$ is finite and that the derivative $\frac{d}{dt}r_{-t}$ exists in $L^1(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. From the last conclusion and (4.10) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int f(\nu) \frac{d}{dt} r_{-t}(\nu) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu) &= \frac{d}{dt} \int f(\nu) r_{-t}(\nu) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu) \\ &= - \int f(\nu) \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-t}) r_{-t}(\nu) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu), \quad t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Recalling that (4.16) and (4.17) show that $t \rightarrow r_{-t}$ is $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ -a.e. absolutely continuous on $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))$, relation (4.18) yields uniquely (4.7). From the existence of $\frac{d}{dt}r_{-t}$ in $L^1(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ it follows that (4.18) holds even for all $f \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. Part (b) is now a direct consequence of (4.18) and condition (j). $\square$

Let us introduce one more condition on $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

(v)

$$(h_i, \cdot)^2 \left(1 + (z'(\cdot, 0))^2 \right) \in L^1(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad i \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$(k, \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta \cdot)^2 \in L^1(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad (k, \cdot)^2 \left((z'(\cdot, 0))^2 \right) \in L^1(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad k \in K,$$

cf. definition of $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$.

Lemma 4.2 *Assume (j)-(v). (a) Then the flow $\nu_t = U_t^+ \nu$, $t \geq 0$, $\nu \in E \cap H$, is associated with a strongly continuous semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ given by*

$$T_t f(\nu) = f(\nu_t), \quad \nu \in E \cap H, \quad t \geq 0, \quad f \in L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}).$$

(b) Let A denote its generator. We have $\tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E) \subseteq D(A)$. If $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ then with f and φ related as in (4.3),

$$Af = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \cdot (h_i, \cdot) (\lambda_i - z'(\cdot, 0)).$$

If $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ then with f and φ as well as φ_0 related as in (4.4),

$$\begin{aligned} Af &= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot (h_i, \cdot) (\lambda_i - z'(\cdot, 0)) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (h_j, k) (h_j, \cdot) (\lambda_j - z'(\cdot, 0)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot \lambda_i (h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot (k, \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta \cdot) - z'(0) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot (h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot (k, \cdot) \right). \end{aligned}$$

(c) Both spaces, $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ as well as $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, are dense in the complete space $D(A)$ with respect to the graph norm $(\langle f, f \rangle + \langle Af, Af \rangle)^{1/2}$.

Proof. Step 1 (a) We show that $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ forms a strongly continuous semigroup in $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$. By Proposition 4.1 (a) and $\text{ess sup}_{\nu \in E \cap H} -\delta(A^f)(\nu) < \infty$ (recall (jv)), we verify that $T_t f = f(\nu_t) \in L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ whenever $f \in L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, $t \geq 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the same we can choose $g \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ such that

$$\|f - g\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot \left(\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \left\| \frac{d\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\boldsymbol{\nu}} \right\|^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \right)^{-1}.$$

Since $t \rightarrow \nu_t$ is by definition $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ -a.e. continuous and $T_t g(\nu) = g(\nu_t)$ we may also choose $t \in (0, 1]$ such that $\|T_t g - g\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} < \varepsilon/2$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_t f - f\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} &\leq \left(\int (f(\nu_t) - g(\nu_t))^2 \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|T_t g - g\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} + \|g - f\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} \\ &\leq \|f - g\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} \cdot \left(\left\| \frac{d\boldsymbol{\nu} \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\boldsymbol{\nu}} \right\|^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \right) + \|T_t g - g\|_{L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu})} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The semigroup property of $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a consequence of its definition via the flow U^+ . In fact, we have $T_s T_t f(\nu) = T_s f(\nu_t) = f(\nu_{s+t}) = T_{s+t} f(\nu)$, $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$, $\nu \in E \cap H$, $t \geq 0$.

Step 2 (b) For the representation of Af , $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(\nu_t) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi(\nu)}{\partial x_i} \cdot (h_i, \nu) (\lambda_i - z'(\nu, 0)), \quad \nu \in E \cap H, \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left\| \left. \frac{d}{dt} f(\nu_t) - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} f(\nu_t) \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)}^2 = 0. \quad (4.20)$$

The representation of $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ as given in (4.3) implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(\nu_t) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi(\nu)}{\partial x_i} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} (h_i, \nu_t). \quad (4.21)$$

In order to verify (4.19), recall Remarks (1)-(3) and (4.6). We get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (h_j, \nu_t) &= \left(h_j, \frac{d\nu_t}{dt} \right) \\ &= (h_j, \nu_t) \left(\lambda_j - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i (h_i, \nu_t) (h_i, 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (h_i, \nu_t) (h_i, 1)} \right) \\ &= (h_j, \nu_t) \left(\lambda_j - \frac{z'(\nu, t)}{z(\nu, t)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

which, together with (4.21), gives (4.19). With (jv) and Proposition 4.1 (a) we verify $\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (h_j, \nu_t) \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Using, in addition the first part of (v), we deduce $\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (h_j, \nu_t) \in L^2(E, \nu)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, with bounded norm in $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus, relation (4.20) is finally a consequence of (4.21), (4.22), and the ν -a.e. right-continuity in t at $t = 0$ of the right-hand side of (4.22).

Step 3 For the representation of Af , $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, we proceed similar to Step 2. We use

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (k, \nu_t) &= \sum_{j=1} (h_j, k) \left(h_j, \frac{d\nu_t}{dt} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1} (h_j, k) (h_j, \nu_t) \left(\lambda_j - \frac{z'(\nu, t)}{z(\nu, t)} \right) \\ &= (k, \tfrac{1}{2} \Delta \nu_t) - (k, \nu_t) \cdot \frac{z'(\nu, t)}{z(\nu, t)} \end{aligned}$$

and the second part of condition (v).

Step 4 (c) Both sets, $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ as well as $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, separate the points in $E \cap H$. By this and condition (j) both sets, $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ as well as $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, determine uniquely $(T_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ given by

$$T_t f(\nu) = f(\nu_t), \quad \nu \in E \cap H, \quad t \in [0, 1], \quad f \in L^2(E, \nu).$$

Since $(A, D(A))$ is by (a) a closed operator we have proved the claim. $\square$

Corollary 4.3 (a) Assume (j)-(v). We have $A'\mathbb{I} = -\delta(A^f)$. For all $f, g \in D(A)$ with $fg \in D(A)$ it holds that

$$\langle -Af, g \rangle + \langle -Ag, f \rangle = \langle \delta(A^f) \cdot f, g \rangle. \quad (4.23)$$

If (jv'), i. e. $\delta(A^f) \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, then (4.23) holds for all $f, g \in D(A)$.

(b) Assume (j)-(jjj), (jv'), and (v). We have $D(A) = D(A')$ and $A'f = -Af + A'\mathbb{I} \cdot f$, $f \in D(A)$.

Proof. Part (a) of the corollary is a standard consequence of Proposition 4.1 (b), Lemma 4.2, and the second part of condition (jv) resp. (jv').

For Part (b), we recall condition (j) as well as relation (4.7) and consider for $f, g \in L^2(E, \nu)$, and $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g, T'_t f \rangle &= \langle T_t g, f \rangle \\ &= \int g(\nu_t) f(\nu) \nu(d\nu) \\ &= \int g(\nu) f(\nu_{-t}) \exp \left\{ - \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \nu(d\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into consideration (jv) this yields $T'_t \mathbb{I} = \exp \left\{ - \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ and

$$T'_t f(\nu) = T'_t \mathbb{I}(\nu) \cdot f(\nu_{-t}) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-a.e. } \nu \in E.$$

Let $\tilde{A} \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T'_t f - f}{t} + \tilde{A}f - A'\mathbb{I} \cdot f &= \frac{T'_t \mathbb{I} \cdot f \circ \nu_{-t} - f}{t} + \tilde{A}f - A'\mathbb{I} \cdot f \\ &= \left(\frac{f \circ \nu_{-t} - f}{t} \cdot T'_t \mathbb{I} + \tilde{A}f \circ \nu_{-t} \right) + \left(\left(\frac{T'_t \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I}}{t} - A'\mathbb{I} \right) \cdot f \right) + (\tilde{A}f - \tilde{A}f \circ \nu_{-t}). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \left(\frac{T'_t \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I}}{t} - A'\mathbb{I} \right) \cdot f \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} = 0$$

by (jv'), $A'\mathbb{I} = -\delta(A^f)$, and $T'_t \mathbb{I} = \exp \left\{ - \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \tilde{A}f - \tilde{A}f \circ \nu_{-t} \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left(\int \left(\tilde{A}f - \tilde{A}f \circ \nu_{-t} \right)^2 d\nu \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left(\int \left(\tilde{A}f(\nu_t) - \tilde{A}f(\nu) \right)^2 \left(\exp \left\{ \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \right) \circ \nu_t \nu(d\nu) \right)^{1/2} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (jv'), Proposition 4.1 (a), and Lemma 4.2 (a). As a consequence of the three last relations,

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \frac{T'_t f - f}{t} + \tilde{A}f - A'\mathbb{I} \cdot f \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} = 0$$

if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \frac{f \circ \nu_{-t} - f}{t} \cdot T'_t \mathbb{1} + \tilde{A}f \circ \nu_{-t} \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} \\
&= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \left(\frac{f - f \circ \nu_t}{t} \cdot T'_t \mathbb{1} \circ \nu_t + \tilde{A}f \right) \cdot \left(\exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \right) \circ \nu_t \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} \\
&= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \left(\frac{f - f \circ \nu_t}{t} \cdot T'_t \mathbb{1} \circ \nu_t + \tilde{A}f \right) \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} \\
&= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \left(\frac{f - f \circ \nu_t}{t} + \tilde{A}f \right) \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left\| \left(\frac{T_t f - f}{t} - \tilde{A}f \right) \right\|_{L^2(E, \nu)} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where, for the transition from the second last to the last line, we have used that $T'_t \mathbb{1} = \exp \left\{ - \int_{s=0}^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\} \xrightarrow{t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{1}$ in $L^\infty(E, \nu)$. $\square$

4.3 Asymptotic Properties of the Particle System

For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D$ let

$$z\{i\} := \{z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n\}$$

and

$$z(i) := \{(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) : y_i \in \partial D\}.$$

Set $\partial^{(1)} D^n := \bigcup_{z \in D^n} \bigcup_i z(i)$ and note that $\partial^{(1)} D^n = \partial D \times D \times \dots \times D \cup \dots \cup D \times \dots \times D \times \partial D$.

Let $B = ((B_t)_{t \geq 0}, (P_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}})$ be an $n \cdot d$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion. Let τ denote the first exit time of B from D^n and let $B^{D^n} = ((B_t^{D^n})_{t \geq 0}, (P_x)_{x \in D^n})$ be obtained by stopping B at time τ . Let us consider a process $X \equiv X^n = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Q_x)_{x \in D^n})$ which is constructed as follows: X_0 is a random point on $(D^n, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$ with distribution $\tilde{\nu}_n$. Inside the state space D^n , the process X follows the regime of an $N \cdot d$ -dimensional Brownian motion. Then, whenever the process X hits the boundary $\partial^{(1)} D^n$, say at some point $y \in z(i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D$, it instantaneously jumps to $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ where

(k) z_i is a random point on $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$ with distribution $\eta_{n, z\{i\}}(x) dx$.

(k1) For $\eta \equiv \eta_{n, z\{i\}} \in C_b^1(D)$ we assume that there exists $c_1 > 1$ neither depending on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ nor on $z\{i\}$ such that

$$c_1^{-1} h_1 \leq \eta_{n, z\{i\}} \leq c_1 h_1.$$

(k2) For ν -a.e. ν , we assume $\eta_{n, z\{i\}} dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu$ whenever $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu$ where every z_j may depend on n .

We note that (k1) yields the following.

(k3) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $z\{i\}$, $\eta_{n, z\{i\}} = 0$ on ∂D in the sense that $\lim_{D \ni x \rightarrow d} \eta_{n, z\{i\}}(x) = 0$, $d \in \partial D$. Furthermore, denoting by $\mathbf{n}$ the inner normal on ∂D ,

$$\sup_{d \in \partial D} \frac{\partial \eta_{n, z\{i\}}}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(d) < \infty.$$

- (k4) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\inf_{z \in \{i\}, x \in K} \eta_{n,z\{i\}}(x) > 0$ for every compact set $K \subset D$.
- (k5)

$$\sup_{n,z\{i\}} \|\eta_{n,z\{i\}}\| < \infty.$$

We note that two independent d -dimensional Brownian particles can almost never hit ∂D at the same time. This implies that X $Q_{\tilde{\nu}_n}$ -almost never reaches $\partial D^n \setminus \partial^{(1)} D^n$. This property allows to identify ∂D^n with $\overline{\partial D \times D \times \dots \times D} \cup \dots \cup \overline{D \times \dots \times D \times \partial D}$. Well-definiteness of the system can now be proved by using condition (k1) and the argument of [1], Lemma 1.

Recalling Sections 2 and 3 we note that $\tilde{\nu}_n$ is obtained from the measure ν_n by the map $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \rightarrow (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \overline{D}$, taking into consideration invariance under permutations of $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$; for details see [13], (sub)sections 2.4-2.6 and 6. For the measure $\tilde{\nu}_n$ we shall assume the following.

- (kk) $\tilde{\nu}_n$ admits a density $\tilde{m}_n$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}$ and $\tilde{m}_n$ is symmetric with respect to the n d -dimensional components of $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}$.

$\tilde{m}_n$ is supported by $\overline{D^n}$ such that

$$0 < \tilde{m}_n \in C^1(D^n), \quad \nabla \tilde{m}_n \in C_b(D^n; \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}).$$

Furthermore, there exist positive constants C_1, C_2 which may depend on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ but are independent of $z \in D^n$ such that

$$C_1 h_1(z_1) \dots h_1(z_n) \leq \tilde{m}_n(z) \leq C_2 h_1(z_1) \dots h_1(z_n).$$

We note that the latter implies $\tilde{m}_n = 0$ on ∂D^n in the sense of $\lim_{D^n \ni x \rightarrow y} \tilde{m}_n(x) = 0$, $y \in \partial D^n$.

- (kkk) Suppose that $-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n$ exists in the sense that

$$\int \frac{1}{2} \Delta \varphi d\tilde{\nu}_n = - \int \varphi \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n \right) dx, \quad \varphi \in \{\psi \in C_b^2(D^n) : \psi(y) = 0, y \in \partial D^n\},$$

and belongs to $L^2(D^n)$.

- (kw) Furthermore, let us assume that

$$\nu_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu.$$

Denote by σ the Lebesgue surface measure on $(\partial D^n, \mathcal{B}(\partial D^n))$ and by s the Lebesgue surface measure on $(\partial D, \mathcal{B}(\partial D))$. In the following, let us arrange the notation according to $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ where $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, $y := (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The transition probability function Q of the process $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Q_x(X_t \in A) &= P_x(B_t^{D^n} \in A) \\ &+ \int_{z \in D^n} \int_{v=0}^t \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{dP_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau \in dv)}{\sigma(dy)} s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) Q_z(X_{t-v} \in A) dz, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

$x \in D^n$, $t \geq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(D^n)$. We mention that this representation involves an ordering among the n particles. In order to explain the relation to the empirical process $X_t^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_t)_i}$, $t \geq 0$, for which the ordering is irrelevant, we refer to a similar situation in [13], (sub)sections 2.4-2.6 and 6.

For $f \in C_b(E)$ let $\tilde{f} \equiv \tilde{f}_n$ be defined by

$$\tilde{f}(z_1, \dots, z_n) := f(\nu) \quad \text{where} \quad \nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \in E_n.$$

For $\beta \geq 0$ and let $\mu_x^{n,\beta} := E_x(e^{-\beta\tau} \tilde{1}(B_\tau))$ and write μ_x^n instead of $\mu_x^{n,0}$, $x \in D^n$. For $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ introduce

$$m_x^{n,\beta}(dz) := \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{d\mu_x^{n,\beta}}{d\sigma}(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) dz, \quad \beta \geq 0.$$

This defines measures $m_x^{n,\beta}$ on $(D^n, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$, $x \in D^n$. We will also write m_x^n instead of $m_x^{n,0}$, $x \in D^n$.

Remarks (7) For $u \in L^\infty(D^n)$ let us define the resolvent relative to the transition probabilities (4.24),

$$G_\beta^n u := \int_{t=0}^{\infty} e^{-\beta t} \int u(y) Q_\cdot(X_t \in dy) dt, \quad \beta > 0.$$

As a straight forward adaption of (4.24) and [13], Proposition 1, one obtains for $\tilde{f} = G_\beta^n u$, $u \in L^\infty(D^n)$, and $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ with $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D$ and $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\tilde{f}(y) = \int_{z_i \in D} \tilde{f}(z) \eta(z_i) dz_i \tag{4.25}$$

where $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n$ have been fixed in the notation $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$. This yields

$$\int_{D^n} \tilde{f} dm_x^{n,\beta} = \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^{n,\beta}, \quad \tilde{f} = G_\beta^n u, \quad u \in L^\infty(D^n), \quad \beta \geq 0. \tag{4.26}$$

(8) Define $C_{b,n}(D^n) := C_b(D^n \cup \partial^{(1)} D^n)$ and let $C_r(D^n)$ denote the space of all $u = v|_{D^n}$ where $v \in C_{b,n}(D^n)$ and $v(y) = \int_{z_i \in D} v(z) \eta(z_i) dz_i$ if $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ and $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Introduce the space $C_{r,c}(D^n) := \{u \in C_r(D^n) : u = U|_{D^n}, U \in C(\overline{D^n})\}$ and endow it with the sup-norm.

Let us keep (4.24)-(4.26) in mind and follow [13], Sections 3 and 4 word for word. Except for a slight modification of Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 3 all arguments can be taken over to the present situation. One arrives at the following version of Theorem 2 in [13].

Let $\beta > 0$ and $D(A^n) := \{G_\beta^n u : u \in C_{r,c}(D^n)\}$ and $A^n u := \frac{1}{2} \Delta u$, $u \in D(A^n)$. The operator $(A^n, D(A^n))$ is the generator of a strongly continuous contraction semigroup $(T_{n,t}^r)_{t \geq 0}$ in $C_{r,c}(D^n)$. For $u \in C_{r,c}(D^n)$, we have $T_{n,t}^r u(x) = \int u(y) Q_x(X_t \in dy)$, $t \geq 0$, $x \in D^n$. Furthermore, $Q_x(X_t \in dy)$ is the unique representing probability measure on $(D^n, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$ of $T_{n,t}^r u(x)$, $u \in D(A^n)$, $t > 0$, $x \in D^n$. As an immediate consequence we obtain (4.25) and (4.26) for $\tilde{f} \in C_{r,c}(D^n)$.

(9) For the proof of Lemma 4.4 (a) below it is important to note that $D(A^n)$ is dense in $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$. According to Remark (8), for this it is sufficient to demonstrate that $C_{r,c}(D^n)$ is dense in $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ and by (kk) that $C_{r,c}(D^n)$ is dense in $L^2(D^n, dz)$ where dz symbolizes in this remark the Lebesgue measure on $(D^n, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$. If this was not true there would exist an $G \in L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ with $\int_{D^n} FG dz = 0$ for all $F \in C_{r,c}(D^n)$. But $G dz \cdot \chi_{D^n} + 0 \cdot \chi_{\partial D^n}$ is a finite signed measure on $(\overline{D^n}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{D^n}))$ which does not belong to the closed linear hull in the weak topology of $\mathcal{M}_{r,c} := \{\eta_{n,z\{i\}} dx \cdot \chi_{z_1 \times \dots \times z_{i-1} \times D \times z_{i+1} \times \dots \times z_n} - \delta_{y_i} \cdot \chi_{z_1 \times \dots \times z_{i-1} \times \overline{D} \times z_{i+1} \times \dots \times z_n} : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, z_1, \dots, z_n \in D, y_i \in \partial D\}$, dx symbolizing in this remark the Lebesgue measure on $(D, \mathcal{B}(D))$. On the other hand, $C_{r,c}(D^n) = \{F \in C(\overline{D^n}) : \int F d\mu = 0 \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_{r,c}\}$, here $F \in C_{r,c}(D^n)$ identifying with its unique extension to $\overline{D^n}$.

(10) Consider a Markov chain on D^n with transition probability kernel $m^n \equiv m^{n,0}$. It is an immediate consequence of condition (k) and [6], Theorem 2.1, that the Markov chain is geometrically ergodic in the sense of this reference and that there exists a unique invariant probability measure. To verify this, define for $\delta > 0$ the sets $D_\delta := \{z \in D : |d - z| > \delta \text{ for all } d \in \partial D\}$, $C_\delta := D_\delta^n$, and

$$\begin{aligned} C_\delta^{(k)} &:= \{z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in D^n : \text{there exist mutually distinct numbers} \\ &\quad i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } z_i \in D_\delta^c \text{ if } i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \text{ and} \\ &\quad z_i \in D_\delta \text{ if } i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}\}, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows now from (k4) that for all $\delta < \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$, $C := C_\delta$ is a small set in the sense of [6] since (4) in [6] is satisfied for the one-step transition probability kernel with ν being the equi-distribution on $(D^n, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$. Furthermore, by the definition of the transition probability kernel m^n and property (k5) there is a $\delta > 0$ such that (7) of [6] is satisfied for $V = 1$ on $C = C_\delta$ and, for example, for $V = \sum_{i=n-k}^{n-1} 3^{ni}$ on $C_\delta^{(k)}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. To show the latter we note that the verification of (7) in [6] for $x \in C_\delta^{(k)}$ reduces to a combinatorial problem. One just has to check on which side of ∂D_δ the $n-k$ d -dimensional particles which start in D_δ are situated at the time of the next jump of X .

(11) Let $\mathbf{M}^n$ denote the invariant probability measure of the Markov chain on D^n with transition probability kernel $m^n \equiv m^{n,0}$ considered in Remark (10). Define by

$$\mathbf{N}^n(dx) := \int K^{D^n}(x, y) \mathbf{M}^n(dy) dx$$

a measure on $(D, \mathcal{B}(D^n))$, where K^{D^n} denotes the Greenian kernel relative to $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ on D^n . Let us show that $\mathbf{N}^n$ is an invariant measure for the process X by verifying $\int A^n u d\mathbf{N}^n = 0$ for all $u \in D(A^n)$. We have for all $u \in D(A^n)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int A^n u d\mathbf{N}^n &= \int \frac{1}{2}\Delta u d\mathbf{N}^n \\ &= \int_{x \in D^n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta u\right)(x) \int_{y \in D^n} K^{D^n}(x, y) \mathbf{M}^n(dy) dx \\ &= \int_{y \in D^n} \int_{x \in D^n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta u\right)(x) K^{D^n}(x, y) dx \mathbf{M}^n(dy) \\ &= \int (h_u - u) d\mathbf{M}^n, \end{aligned}$$

h_u denoting the harmonic function that satisfies $h_u = u$ on ∂D^n . Now we are going to use the fact that $\mathbf{M}^n$ is invariant with respect to $m_x^n \equiv m_x^{n,0}$. Furthermore, we will use (4.26). We verify in this way for all $u \in D(A^n)$

$$\begin{aligned} \int A^n u \, d\mathbf{N}^n &= \int h_u \, d\mathbf{M}^n - \int u \, d\mathbf{M}^n \\ &= \int h_u \, d\mathbf{M}^n - \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{z \in D^n} u(z) m_x^n(dz) \mathbf{M}^n(dx) \\ &= \int h_u \, d\mathbf{M}^n - \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} u(y) \mu_x^n(dy) \mathbf{M}^n(dx) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f = \varphi((h_1, \cdot), \dots, (h_r, \cdot)) \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$, let us introduce

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta f(\nu) := \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \cdot (h_i, \nu) + \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i,j=1}^r \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \cdot (\nabla h_i \cdot \nabla h_j, \nu), \quad \nu \in E_n,$$

where $\nabla h_i \cdot \nabla h_j$ is the scalar product of ∇h_i and ∇h_j in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Also, let us recall that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{z_k} \in E_n$, we have the representation

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n h_1(z_k), \dots, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n h_r(z_k) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta f(\nu), \quad (4.27)$$

cf. [13] and [14]. Recall also Lemma 4.2 and for $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and φ related as in (4.3) set

$$Bf := \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \cdot \lambda_i(h_i, \cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad Cf := -z'(0) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \cdot (h_i, \cdot).$$

Similarly, if $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ with f and φ as well as φ_0 are related as in (4.4) set

$$\begin{aligned} Bf &:= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot \lambda_i(h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j(h_j, k)(h_j, \cdot) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot \lambda_i(h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot (k, \frac{1}{2} \Delta \cdot) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Cf &:= -z'(0) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot (h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (h_j, k)(h_j, \cdot) \right) \\ &= -z'(0) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \varphi_0 \cdot (h_i, \cdot) + \varphi \varphi'_0 \cdot (k, \cdot) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We have $Af = Bf + Cf$ for all $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. Let us furthermore set

$$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) := -\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n(x) \, dx.$$

Lemma 4.4 Suppose (j)-(v) and (k)-(kw). (a) The process $X \equiv X^n = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Q_x)_{x \in D^n})$ is associated with a strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$.

(b) Let $f \in C_b(E_n)$ such that the (unique) continuous extension of $\tilde{f}$ to D^n belongs to $C_b^2(D^n)$. Then, using the notation $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $y \equiv (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial D^n$ where $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, we have $f \in D(A_n)$ if and only if

$$\int_{z_i \in D} (\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y)) \eta(z_i) dz_i = 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma\text{-a.e. } y \in \partial D^n.$$

In this case $A_n f = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta f$.

(c) Let $f \in C_b(E_n)$ such that the continuous extension of $\tilde{f}$ to D^n belongs to $C_b^2(D^n)$ and let $g \in L^2(E, \nu_n)$ such that $\tilde{g} \in C^2(D^n)$ and $\tilde{g} \cdot \tilde{n}_n = 0$ on ∂D^n . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int \tilde{g}(x) \int (\tilde{f}(y) - \tilde{f}(x)) Q_x(X_t \in dy) \tilde{\nu}_n(dx) \\ = \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n + \int \tilde{f} d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta(\tilde{g} \tilde{m}_n) \right) (x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

(d) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $D_b^2(A_n)$ of all $f \in D(A_n) \cap C_b(E_n)$ such that the continuous extension of $\tilde{f}$ to D^n belongs to $C_b^2(D^n)$ is dense in the complete space $D(A_n)$ with respect to the graph norm $(\langle f, f \rangle_n + \langle A_n f, A_n f \rangle_n)^{1/2}$.

Proof. For the Brownian motion $((B_t)_{t \geq 0}, (P_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}})$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}$ we will consider its components $((B_{i,t})_{t \geq 0}, (P_{x_i})_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d})$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let τ_i denote the first exit time of $B_{\cdot, i}$ from D , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Step 1 We verify (a). By (kk) we obtain for $f \in L^\infty(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ with $f \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int \tilde{f}(x) P(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) \right\|_{L^1(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)} &= \int_{x \in D^n} \tilde{f}(x) \int_{z \in D^n} P_z(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) \tilde{m}_n(z) dz \\ &\leq C_2 \int_{x \in D^n} \tilde{f}(x) \int_{z \in D^n} P_z(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) h_1(z_1) \dots h_1(z_n) dz \\ &= C_2 \int_{x \in D^n} \tilde{f}(x) e^{n\lambda_1 t} h_1(x_1) \dots h_1(x_n) dx \\ &\leq \frac{C_2 e^{n\lambda_1 t}}{C_1} \int_{x \in D^n} \tilde{f}(x) \tilde{m}_n(x) dx \equiv \frac{C_2 e^{n\lambda_1 t}}{C_1} \int f d\nu_n, \quad t > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Next we use the fact that, for fixed $y \equiv (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial D^n$,

$$\frac{P_{x_j}(\tau_j \geq t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j)}{dz_j} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_k t} h_k(x_j) h_k(z_j) \quad (4.30)$$

as well as, with $\mathbf{n}$ being the inner normal vector on ∂D ,

$$\frac{P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i)}{s(dy_i)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{\lambda_k t} h_k(x_i) \frac{\partial h_k}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(y_i) dt. \quad (4.31)$$

Let H_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacian on functions defined on D^n and normed in $L^2(D^n)$ and let $0 > 2\lambda_{n,1} \geq 2\lambda_{n,2} \dots$ denote the corresponding

eigenvalues. Using again the convention $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau \in dt)}{\sigma(dy) \times dt} s(dy_i) \cdot \eta_{n, z_{\{i\}}}(z_i) \tilde{m}_n(x) dx \\
& \leq C_2 \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau \in dt)}{\sigma(dy) \times dt} s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) H_1(x) dx \\
& = C_2 \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{P_{x_j}(\tau_j \geq t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j)}{dz_j} \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i)}{s(dy_i) \times dt} s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) H_1(x) dx \\
& = C_2 \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty -\lambda_{n,k} e^{\lambda_{n,k} t} H_k(x) \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{z_i \in D} H_k(z) dz_i \cdot \eta(z_i) \right) H_1(x) dx \\
& = -C_2 \lambda_{n,1} e^{\lambda_{n,1} t} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{z_i \in D} H_1(z) dz_i \cdot \eta(z_i) \\
& \leq -C_2 \lambda_{n,1} e^{\lambda_{n,1} t} n \|h_1\|_{L^1(D)} \cdot c_1 H_1(z) \\
& \leq -\frac{nc_1 \|h_1\|_{L^1(D)} C_2}{C_1} \lambda_{n,1} e^{\lambda_{n,1} t} \cdot \tilde{m}_n(z), \quad t > 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where we have used (kk) for the first and the last “ $\leq$ ” sign, (4.30) as well as (4.31) and Gauss’ theorem for the second “ $=$ ” sign, and (k1) for the second last “ $\leq$ ” sign.

Let $\gamma := -(nc_1 \|h_1\|_{L^1(D)} C_2 / C_1) \lambda_{n,1}$ and choose $f \in L^\infty(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$ with $f \geq 0$. From (4.24), (4.32), and Gronwall’s inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \tilde{f}(x) Q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(X_t \in dx) & \leq \int \tilde{f}(x) P_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) + \gamma \int_{v=0}^t \int \tilde{f}(x) Q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(X_v \in dx) dv \\
& \leq \int \tilde{f}(x) P_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) + \gamma \int_{v=0}^t e^{\gamma(t-v)} \int \tilde{f}(x) P_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(B_v^{D^n} \in dx) dv.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the Schwarz’ inequality we find with (4.29) and monotone convergence that for $f \in L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \left(\int \tilde{f}(x) Q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(X_t \in dx) \right)^2 d\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n \leq \int \tilde{f}^2(x) Q_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(X_t \in dx) \\
& \leq \int \tilde{f}^2(x) P_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(B_t^{D^n} \in dx) + \gamma \int_{v=0}^t e^{\gamma(t-v)} \int \tilde{f}^2(x) P_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n}(B_v^{D^n} \in dx) dv \\
& \leq \frac{C_2 e^{n\lambda_1 t}}{C_1} \int f^2 d\boldsymbol{\nu}_n + \gamma \frac{C_2}{C_1} \int_{v=0}^t e^{\gamma(t-v)} e^{n\lambda_1 v} \int f^2 d\boldsymbol{\nu}_n dv.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

This says that the process $X \equiv X^n = ((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (Q_x)_{x \in D^n})$ is associated with a semigroup on $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_n)$. Let $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$, denote the corresponding semigroup on $L^2(E, \boldsymbol{\nu}_n)$. It remains to

demonstrate that $(T_{n,t})_{t \geq 0}$ is strongly continuous in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$. As an immediate consequence of (4.33) there is a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^2(E, \nu_n)$ and all $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\langle T_{n,t} f, T_{n,t} f \rangle_n \leq C_3 \langle f, f \rangle_n.$$

But this together with Remarks (8) (9) of this section guarantees strong continuity. The proof is just an adaption of [14], proof of Proposition 4.5, Step 1 from (4.26) on.

Step 2 We prove (b) and (c). Let $\tilde{f} \in C_b^2(D^n)$. Furthermore, denote by $(y)_i$ the i -th d -dimensional component of $y \equiv (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial D^n$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$. Let us use the notation

$$\int_i \int \equiv \int_{z_1, \dots, z_{i-1} \in D, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D}$$

By (4.24) we have for $x \in D^n$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int \left(\tilde{f}(y) - \tilde{f}(x) \right) Q_x(X_t \in dy) \\ &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right) (y) P_x(B_t^{D^n} \in dy) - \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right) (x) \right) \\ &+ \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int \tilde{f}(y) P_x(B_t^{D^n} \in dy) - \int \tilde{f}(y) P_x(B_t \in dy) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{z_i \in D} \tilde{f}(z) \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} s(dy_i) \eta(z_i) dz \\ &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right) (y) P_x(B_t^{D^n} \in dy) - \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right) (x) \right) \\ &+ \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{z_i \in D} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \times \\ &\quad \times \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} s(dy_i) \eta(z_i) dz \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

and are interested in the existence of this limit in $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$. We note that the limit in the second line exists in $C(\bar{D}^n)$ and because of (kk) also in $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$. According to (4.30) and (4.31) the derivative

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} \\ &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int_{v=0}^t \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{P_{x_j}(\tau_j \geq v, B_{j,v} \in dz_j)}{dz_j} \frac{P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dv, B_{i,v} \in dy_i)}{s(dy_i)} \\ &= \prod_{j \neq i} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_k(x_j) h_k(z_j) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} h_l(x_i) \frac{\partial h_l}{\partial \mathbf{n}}(y_i) \end{aligned}$$

exists in the distributional sense. We also remind of $\mu_x^n(dy)/\sigma(dy) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} -\lambda_{n,m}^{-1} H_m(x) \cdot (\partial H_m / \partial \mathbf{n}_n(y))$ where $\mathbf{n}_n$ denotes the inner normal vector on ∂D^n . In fact, for $\tilde{\varphi} \in C(D^n)$

with $\tilde{\varphi} = 0$ on ∂D^n such that $-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\tilde{\varphi}$ exists in the sense of condition (kkk) and $\tilde{\psi}$ satisfying the conditions for $\tilde{f}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{z_i \in D} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_{x \in D^n} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} \times \\
& \quad \times \tilde{\varphi}(x) \tilde{\psi}(z) dx s(dy_i) \eta(z_i) dz \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{z_i \in D} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} H_m(x) \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mathbf{n}_n}(y) \times \\
& \quad \times \tilde{\varphi}(x) \tilde{\psi}(z) dx s(dy_i) \eta(z_i) dz \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\tilde{\varphi}, H_m)_{L^2(D^n)} \int_i \int \int_{y_i \in \partial D} -\lambda_{n,m}^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mathbf{n}_n}(y) s(dy_i) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{z_i \in D} \tilde{\psi}(z) \eta(z_i) dz \\
&= \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\tilde{\varphi}, \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} -\lambda_{n,m}^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial H_m}{\partial \mathbf{n}_n}(y) H_m(\cdot) s(dy_i) \times \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \int_{z_i \in D} \tilde{\psi}(z) \eta(z_i) dz \right)_{L^2(D^n)} \\
&= \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\tilde{\varphi}, \int_{z \in D^n} \tilde{\psi}(z) m^n(dz) \right)_{L^2(D^n)}. \tag{4.35}
\end{aligned}$$

Well-definiteness for $\tilde{\varphi}$ and especially $\tilde{\psi}$ as specified above follows from the third line together with property (k5) and Gauss' formula. Similarly, one shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \int_{z_i \in D} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_{x \in D^n} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} \times \\
& \quad \times \tilde{\varphi}(x) \tilde{\psi}(y) dx s(dy_i) \eta(z_i) dz \\
&= \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\tilde{\varphi}, \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{\psi}(y) \mu^n(dy) \right)_{L^2(D^n)}. \tag{4.36}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows now from (4.34)-(4.36) that the limit

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int \left(\tilde{f}(y) - \tilde{f}(x) \right) Q_x(X_t \in dy) \\
&= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left(\int \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right)(y) P_x(B_t^{D^n} \in dy) - \left(\tilde{f} - h_{\tilde{f}} \right)(x) \right) \\
& \quad + \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \times
\end{aligned}$$

$$\times \frac{d^+}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \frac{P_x(B_\tau \in dy, \tau < t)}{\sigma(dy)} \eta(z_i) dz_i \sigma(dy)$$

exists in $L^2(D^n, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ if and only if $\int_{z_i \in D} (\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y)) \eta(z_i) dz_i = 0$ for σ -a.e. $y \in \partial D^n$. Furthermore, (4.34)-(4.36) imply also part (c).

Step 3 For part (d), we remind of the statement in (a) which implies that the empirical process $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ is associated with a strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2(E, \nu_n)$. Consequently, $(A_n, D(A_n))$ is a closed operator in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$. According to Remark (8) the transition probabilities of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ are already uniquely determined by $T_{n,t}^r u$, $t \geq 0$, $u \in D_b^2(A_n)$. This implies the claim. $\square$

Proposition 4.5 *Suppose (j)-(v) and (k)-(kw).*

(a) *For $f \in C_b(E)$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f}(y) \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} - \int f z'(\cdot, 0) d\nu.$$

For $f \in C_b(E)$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\tilde{f} \equiv \widetilde{f|_{E_n}} \in C(\overline{D^n})$ as well as $\tilde{f} = 0$ on ∂D^n and, in particular, for $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ we have

$$\int f z'(\cdot, 0) d\nu = 0. \quad (4.37)$$

(b) *For $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ we have*

$$\int \tilde{f} d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle Cf, \mathbb{1} \rangle,$$

(c) *For $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ we have*

$$\int \tilde{f} d \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle Bf, \mathbb{1} \rangle.$$

Proof. Step 1 We verify (a). For $y \in \partial D^n$ we keep using the notation $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$ where $y_i \in \partial D$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In addition, for $x \in D^n$ we use the representation $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $x_1, \dots, x_n \in D$. As in Lemma 4.4, for the Brownian motion $((B_t)_{t \geq 0}, (P_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}})$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}$ we will also consider its components $((B_{i,t})_{t \geq 0}, (P_{x_i})_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d})$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let τ_i denote the first exit time of $B_{\cdot, i}$ from D , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let us use the notation

$$\int_{i, y_i} \int \equiv \int_{z_1, \dots, z_{i-1} \in D} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_{z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D}$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f}(y) \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{i, y_i} \int \tilde{f}(y) \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) \times \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
& = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{i, y_i} \int f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{y_i}\right) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{t=0}^{\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $f \in C_b(E)$. We recall that, by definition, E is compact. Thus, f is uniformly continuous on E . Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z_1, \dots, z_n \in D, r \in \partial D} \left| f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_r\right) - f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \right| = 0.$$

The last two relations imply

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f}(y) \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
& = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{z \in D^n} f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{t=0}^{\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i > t, B_{i,t} \in dz_i) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{y_i \in \partial D} P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
& = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{z \in D^n} f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \times \\
& \quad \times \int_{t=0}^{\varepsilon} \prod_{j=1}^n P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Now we recall Remarks (2) and (3) of this section as well as $\nu(H) = 1$ (cf. condition (j)), $\tilde{\nu}_n(dz) = \int K^{D^n}(x, z) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) dz$ (cf. condition (kkk)), and $\nu_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu$ (cf. condition (kw)). Let $\nu \in H$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu$. For the next calculations we give particular attention to

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \int_{v \in D} g(v) \frac{P_v(\tau_i \leq t)}{t} dv = - \int \frac{1}{2} (\Delta g)(v) dv, \quad g dv \in H, \tag{4.40}$$

cf. Remark (3), which yields

$$\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{z_i}(\tau_i \in dt) \right) \Big|_{t=0} = P_\nu(\tau_i \in dt)|_{t=0} = -z'(\nu, 0) dt.$$

Furthermore,

$$\left(K^{D^n}(x, z) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) dz - \int_{t=0}^{\varepsilon} \prod_{j=1}^n P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \tag{4.41}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, both items seen as mappings from measures over empirical probability measures to measures over $D^n \times D^n$. From (4.39)-(4.41) and stochastic continuity of all $((B_{i,t})_{t \geq 0}, (P_{x_i})_{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d})$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{1}{n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f}(y) \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{z \in D^n} f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \times \\ & \quad \times \int_{t=0}^{\varepsilon} \prod_{j=1}^n P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{z_i}(\tau_i \in dt) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= - \int f z'(\cdot, 0) d\boldsymbol{\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

For the proof of (b) and (c) assume $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ with $f = \varphi((h_1, \cdot), (h_2, \cdot), \dots, (h_r, \cdot))$. The case $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ can be handled in a similar fashion.

Step 2 Let us prepare the proof of (b) and (c). Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $y \equiv y^n \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ such that $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$ with $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, $y_i \in \partial D$. In addition for $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}$, let $\mu^{i, y_i} \equiv (\mu^{i, y_i})^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{y_i}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Moreover, set

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i,k}^n(y) &:= \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \varphi \left((h_1, \mu^{i, y_i}) + \frac{1}{n} (h_1(z_i) - h_1(y_i)), \dots, \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (h_{k-1}, \mu^{i, y_i}) + \frac{1}{n} (h_{k-1}(z_i) - h_{k-1}(y_i)), (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}) + \frac{t}{n} (h_k(z_i) - h_k(y_i)), \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. (h_{k+1}, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots, (h_r, \mu^{i, y_i}) \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots) \right) dt, \end{aligned}$$

$k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & n \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ &= n \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\varphi \left(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}) + \frac{1}{n} (h_k(z_i) - h_k(y_i)), \dots \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^r \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots) \right) \cdot \int_{z_i \in D} (h_k(z_i) - h_k(y_i)) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{z_i \in D} r_{i,k}^n(y) (h_k(z_i) - h_k(y_i)) \eta(z_i) dz_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}} |r_{j,k}^n(y)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ for any sequence $y \equiv y^n \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ with $(\mu^{i, y_i})^n \implies \mu$ and every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we obtain in this case

$$n \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_i} \cdot (h_i, \mu) \quad (4.42)$$

uniformly bounded with respect to ν -a.e. μ , recall also condition (k2). The following is a preparation for the proof of Lemma 4.12 below. Let a be a real measurable bounded function on E which is continuous on each E_n such that for all $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \Rightarrow \mu$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z'_i} \Rightarrow \mu$ we have $|a(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i}) - a(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z'_i})| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Assume furthermore $\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_i} \cdot (h_i, \cdot) = 0$ ν -a.e. Then replacing in the calculations of the present step $\eta(z_i)$ by $\eta(z_i) \cdot \tilde{a}(z)$ it turns out that

$$n \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) \cdot \tilde{a}(z) dz_i \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

uniformly bounded with respect to ν -a.e. μ if as above $(\mu^{i, y_i})^n \Rightarrow \mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 3 We prove (b). Relations (4.42) and part (a) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \tilde{f} d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} - \sum_{i=1}^r \int \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial u_i} \cdot (h_i, \cdot) z'(\cdot, 0) d\nu \\ &= \langle Cf, \mathbb{I} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Step 4 We prove (c). Recalling (4.38) we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{i, y_i} \int f \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{y_i} \right) \times \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \int_{t=0}^\varepsilon \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

We keep using the notation of Step 2 of the proof of Lemma 4.4 and continue

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{t=0}^\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_i \left(f \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{y_i} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - f \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{z_j} + \frac{1}{n} \delta_{x_i} \right) \right) \times \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(B_{i,t} \in dy_i, \tau_i \in dt) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Proceeding as in Step 1 of this proof but replacing z_i by x_i in the definition of $r_{i,k}^n(y)$ we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots) \times \\
&\quad \times \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} (h_k(x_i) - h_k(y_i)) \times \\
&\quad \times \int_{t=0}^\varepsilon \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
&+ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_i \int \sum_{k=1}^r \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y_i \in \partial D} r_{i,k}^n(y) (h_k(x_i) - h_k(y_i)) \times \\
&\quad \times \int_{t=0}^\varepsilon \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx).
\end{aligned}$$

We note that all $h_k(y_i) = 0$ and recall that $\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}} |r_{j,k}^n(y)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ for any sequence $y \equiv y^n \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ with $(\mu^{i, y_i})^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu$ and every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \int_i \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu^{i, y_i}), \dots) \times \\
&\quad \times \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{t=0}^\varepsilon \prod_{j \neq i} P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) h_k(x_i) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt, B_{i,t} \in dy_i) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx).
\end{aligned}$$

By using (4.40), (4.41), $P_{x_i}(\tau_j > t, B_{i,t} \in \cdot) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} \delta_{x_i}$, $\mu^{i, y_i} - \mu \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n(x) dx$ we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{z \in D^n} \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu), \dots) \times \\
&\quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \int_{x_i \in D} h_k(x_i) \frac{P_{x_i}(\tau_i \leq t)}{t} dx_i \times \\
&\quad \times \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{t=0}^\infty \prod_{j=1}^n P_{x_j}(\tau_j > t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j) dt \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx).
\end{aligned}$$

With $\nu(H) = 1$, cf. condition (j), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\
&= \int \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \varphi(\dots, (h_k, \mu), \dots) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta h_k, \mu \right) \nu(d\mu) = \langle Bf, \mathbb{1} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.4 A class of measures satisfying (j),(jj),(v) and (k)-(kw)

Next we are going to introduce the class of initial configurations we are particularly interested in.

- (l) There exists $c > 1$ such that ν is concentrated on the class $\hat{H}$ consisting of all probability measures $d(x) dx \in E$ with $d \in C^\infty(\bar{D})$ satisfying

$$\frac{h_1}{c} \leq d \leq ch_1 \quad \text{and} \quad (-\lambda_1) \cdot \frac{h_1}{c} \leq \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\right) d \leq (-\lambda_1) \cdot ch_1$$

such that $d' := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_i} (d, h_i) \cdot h_i \in L^1(D)$ and $(d'/\|d'\|_{L^1}) dx \in E \cap H$.

- (ll) With the notation $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tilde{\nu}_n(dz) := \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{i=1}^n d(z_i) \nu(d\nu) dz_1 \dots dz_n.$$

Proposition 4.6 *Suppose (l) and (ll). Then we have (j),(jj),(v) and (kk)-(kw) of Subsections 4.2 and 4.3.*

Proof. Step 1 It is obvious that (l) implies (jj) and (v). We show that (l) yields (j). For this, let $\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Our goal is to demonstrate that there is $\mu = m(x) dx \in E \cap H$ such that $\mu = \nu_{-t}$, i. e., $\mu_t = \nu$. Since $d' := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_i} (d, h_i) \cdot h_i \in L^1(D)$ and $(d'(x)/\|d'\|_{L^1}) dx \in E \cap H$, the solution to $\frac{1}{2}\Delta u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ with initial condition $u(0, \cdot) = d'/\|d'\|_{L^1}$ gives $u(1-t, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_i t} (d, h_i) \cdot h_i$ and $m(x) dx := (d'(x)/\|d'\|_{L^1}) dx)_{1-t} = ((u(1-t, x)/\|u(1-t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(D)}) dx \in E \cap H$.

It follows that $(m(x) dx)_t \in E \cap H$. Moreover, $(m(x) dx)_t = \nu$ is obvious by Remark (1) of this section. In other words, $m(x) dx$ is the wanted measure μ .

Step 2 Conditions (kk) and (kkk) follow directly from (l) and (ll). We continue with the verification of (kw). With $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ with $f(\nu) = \varphi((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu))$, $\nu \in E$, as in given (4.3) and $\tilde{f}(z) = f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right)$ on $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ on D^n , we have by (l) and (ll)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E f d\nu_n &= \int_{D^n} \tilde{f}(z) \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{i=1}^n d(z_i) \nu(d\nu) dz_1 \dots dz_n \\ &= \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{D^n} f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz \nu(d\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose we are give a sequence $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ of independent D -valued random variables, all with probability distribution $d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. Then the weak law of large numbers shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{D^n} f\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz \\ = \int_{D^n} \varphi\left(\left(h_1, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right), \dots, \left(h_r, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}\right)\right) \prod_{j=1}^n P(Z_j \in dz_j) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n h_1(Z_j), \dots, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n h_r(Z_j) \right) \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} h_1(Z_j), \dots, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} h_r(Z_j) \right) \\
&= \varphi((h_1, d), \dots, (h_r, d)) = f(d(x) dx)
\end{aligned}$$

boundedly in $d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. The last two relations combined with condition (l) give finally

$$\int_E f d\boldsymbol{\nu}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} f(\nu) d\boldsymbol{\nu} = \int_E f d\boldsymbol{\nu}.$$

We have verified (kw). $\square$

For $z_1, \dots, z_n, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $z^{(i)}(v)$ denote the vector $(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, v, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$. For a real function f on $\mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d}$, let $\Delta_i f$ denote the d -dimensional Laplace operator with respect to i -th d -dimensional argument applied to f . For example, for f with argument $z^{(i)}(v)$, $\Delta_i f$ is the Laplace operator with respect to v applied to f . For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let us define $\nu_{n,i} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{z_j}$ and choose

(lll)

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) &:= \frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_D \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta d\right)(x) / d(x) \nu_{n,i}(dx) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)}{\int_{v \in D} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n\right)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv} \\
&= \frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_D \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta d\right)(x) / d(x) \nu_{n,i}(dx) \cdot d(z_i) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_D \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta d\right)(x) dx \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.7 (a) Suppose (l)-(lll). Then we have (k1) and (k2).

(b) Let $\Phi : \hat{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded on $\hat{H}$ and continuous in $\nu_0 \equiv d_0(x) dx \in \hat{H}$ in the sense of $\lim_{\|d-d_0\|_{L^1(D)} \rightarrow 0} |\Phi(\nu) - \Phi(\nu_0)| = 0$ where $\nu \equiv d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. Then

$$\frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \Phi(\nu) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)} \longrightarrow \Phi(\nu_0) \quad \text{as} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_0.$$

Proof. The above definition yields directly (k1). We verify (k2). For $\nu \equiv d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $z_i \in D$ set

$$\hat{\nu}(d\nu) \equiv \hat{\nu}_{z_i}(d\nu) := \int_{x \in D} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta d\right)(x) dx \cdot \frac{1}{d(z_i)} \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)$$

and choose $\nu_0 \equiv d_0(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. We note that (l) implies $\hat{\nu}(\hat{H}) < \infty$. Let $\Phi : \hat{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be as in the formulation of part (b) of this proposition. Define

$$g_\Phi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right) := \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \Phi(\nu) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu).$$

According to the weak law of large numbers, for all $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{D^n} g_\Phi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right) \cdot f \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right) dz \\ &= \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{D^n} f \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz \cdot \Phi(\nu) \hat{\nu}(d\nu) \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} f(\nu) \Phi(\nu) \hat{\nu}(d\nu). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have demonstrated that

$$\frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \Phi(\nu) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu)} = \frac{g_\Phi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right)}{g_{\mathbf{1}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \right)} \longrightarrow \Phi(\nu_0)$$

as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_0$. Repeating the previous calculations with ν instead of $\hat{\nu}$, we get part (b) of the present lemma. Let us continue to examine the “ $\hat{\nu}$ -case”. The last limit shows that the measure $\prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu) / \int \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu)$ converges weakly to the one point probability measure concentrated on ν_0 as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_0$. This implies also

$$\frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \Phi(\nu) \cdot \frac{\int_D (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(x)/d(x) \nu_{n,i}(dx)}{\int_D (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(x) dx} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \hat{\nu}(d\nu)} \longrightarrow \Phi(\nu_0)$$

as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_0$. Choosing now $\varphi \in C(\overline{D})$,

$$\Phi(\nu) := \int_{x \in D} \varphi(x) d(x) dx, \quad \nu \equiv d(x) dx \in \hat{H},$$

and recalling the definition of $\hat{\nu}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_D \varphi \eta_{n,z\{i\}} dx \\ &= \frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_D (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(x)/d(x) \nu_{n,i}(dx) \cdot \int_{z_i \in D} \varphi(z_i) d(z_i) dz_i \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} d(z_j) \nu(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_D (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(x) dx \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} d(z_j) \nu(d\nu)} \\ &\longrightarrow \int_D \varphi d_0 dx \end{aligned}$$

as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{weak}} \nu_0$ with $\nu_0(dx) = d_0(x) dx$. We have verified (k2). $\square$

Remarks (12) on condition (jjj). One goal of the paper is to demonstrate Mosco type convergence for the Fleming-Viot type system. In order to establish the integration by parts formula in Corollary 4.3 which we will use for this, it is quite natural to require the differentiability in the form of (jjj) of the related reference measure ν .

(13) on conditions (jv) and (jv'). We recall also $T_t f(\nu) = f(\nu_t)$ and that therefore $T_t : L^2(E, \nu) \rightarrow L^2(E, \nu)$ is equivalent with $d\nu \circ \nu_{-t} / d\nu \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$. Proposition 4.1 (a) together with (j) motivate therefore the first part of condition (jv). Condition (jv') is motivated by Corollary 4.3 together with condition (c6(ii)) of Section 2. So far, we have used (jv') just in Corollary 4.3. However it also will become important below, from Proposition 4.10 (c) on.

(14) on condition (l). Looking at the spectral representation of the solution to the equation $\frac{1}{2}\Delta u = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ with initial condition $u(0, \cdot) = d' / \|d'\|_{L^1}$ it turns out that (l) is an implicit condition on the decay of (d, h_i) , $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

4.5 Integration by Parts on E_n

Lemma 4.8 Assume (l)-(lll) and let c be the constant specified in condition (l). Then we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ with $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{m}_n)(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} - \frac{\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_i \tilde{m}_n)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \right| \leq \frac{-\lambda_1 c^2}{n}.$$

Proof. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. According to (ll), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{m}_n)(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} &= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \int (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(z_j) \cdot \prod_{j' \neq j} d(z_{j'}) d\nu}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\ &= \frac{\int \left(\int_D \left((-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d) / d \right) d\nu_{n,i} \cdot d(z_i) + \frac{1}{n} (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(z_i) \right) \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} d(z_j) d\nu}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\ &= \frac{\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_i \tilde{m}_n)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\int ((-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(z_i) / d(z_i)) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) d\nu}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

where we have used (lll) for the last equality sign. Recalling (l) and (ll), the lemma follows now from

$$\left| \frac{\int ((-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)(z_i) / d(z_i)) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) d\nu}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \right| \leq \left\| \frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)}{d} \right\| \leq -\lambda_1 c^2.$$

$\square$

We continue with an auxiliary lemma. For this we recall the definitions of $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ in (4.3) and $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ in (4.4).

Lemma 4.9 (a) The set $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ is dense in $C_b(E)$. Both sets, $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, are dense in $L^2(E, \nu_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as $L^2(E, \nu)$.

(b) Let $h_n \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\langle h_n, h_n \rangle_n$ is bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, let $h \in L^2(E, \nu)$ and assume $\langle f, h_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, h \rangle$ for all $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ or for all $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. Then $h_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} h$.

(c) For every $f \in C(E'_n)$ there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\varphi = f$ on E_n .

(d) Suppose (l) and (ll). For every $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$ there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\varphi = f$ ν -a.e. on E .

Proof. Density of $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ in $C_b(E)$ is a consequence of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem and Remark (4) of this section. Anything else in part (a) is now obvious. To verify (b), let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, and choose $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ or $f \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ with $\langle \varphi - f, \varphi - f \rangle < \varepsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi - f, \varphi - f \rangle_n &= \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n + \langle f, f \rangle_n - 2\langle \varphi, f \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle + \langle f, f \rangle - 2\langle \varphi, f \rangle \\ &= \langle \varphi - f, \varphi - f \rangle < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

since $\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle$ by $\varphi \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, $\langle f, f \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, f \rangle$ by $\nu_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu$ according to (kw), and $\langle \varphi, f \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \varphi, f \rangle$ by (c2). Recall also the introduction to Section 3, especially $\mathcal{F} = C_b(E)$ and Proposition 3.1. Claim (b) follows now from

$$|\langle \varphi, h_n \rangle_n - \langle f, h_n \rangle_n| \leq \langle \varphi - f, \varphi - f \rangle_n^{1/2} \cdot \langle h_n, h_n \rangle_n^{1/2},$$

$|\langle \varphi, h \rangle - \langle f, h \rangle| \leq \langle \varphi - f, \varphi - f \rangle^{1/2} \cdot \langle h, h \rangle^{1/2}$, and the hypotheses of (b).

For part (c) we mention that E'_n is a closed set of the metric space E . By the Tietze extension theorem there is a continuous extension F of f to E , i. e., $F \in C_b(E) = \mathcal{F}$, recall for this again the introduction to Section 3. The rest is trivial since $\varphi := f$ on E_n and $\varphi = g$ on $E \setminus E_n$ for any $g \in C_b(E)$ yield an element of $\mathcal{C}$ which proves claim (c).

Let us focus on (d). We set $\varphi \equiv \varphi_f := f$ on $E \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$. Furthermore, we define $\varphi \equiv \varphi_f$ on E_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by

$$\varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) := \frac{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) \mid dx \in \hat{H}\}} f(\nu) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \nu(d\nu)}{\int_{\{\nu=d(x) \mid dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \nu(d\nu)} \quad (4.44)$$

where $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$. It follows from (l) and (ll) that φ is bounded and continuous on E_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In order to show $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$ we have to verify (c2') of Section 3 and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}$. Using now the particular structure of ν_n and ν this means we have to show

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_n &= \int_{\{\nu=d(x) \mid dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{z \in D^n} \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \psi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz_1 \dots dz_n d\nu \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\hat{H}} \varphi \psi d\nu, \quad \psi \in C_b(E), \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_n &= \int_{\{\nu=d(x) \mid dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{z \in D^n} \varphi^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz_1 \dots dz_n d\nu \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\hat{H}} \varphi^2 d\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

We recall Proposition 4.7 (b) and assume for a moment that f is bounded and lower semicontinuous. Since f is in this case the supremum of some sequence of bounded and continuous functions on E we obtain

$$\liminf \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \geq \varphi(\nu) \quad \text{as} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \nu$$

for all $\nu \in \hat{H}$. Similarly, if f was upper semicontinuous we would get

$$\limsup \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \leq \varphi(\nu) \quad \text{as} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \nu.$$

We recall definition (4.44) and keep the last two relations in mind. If f is just bounded and measurable, the Vitali-Carathéodory theorem yields $\lim \varphi \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) = \varphi(\nu)$ as $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \nu$ for ν -almost all $\nu \in \hat{H}$. For bounded measurable f we get (4.45) and (4.46) immediately. For unbounded f we use $f_r := ((-r) \vee f) \wedge r$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, first and verify (4.45) and (4.46) for f_r . Then we observe that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi - \varphi_r, \varphi - \varphi_r \rangle_n &\leq \int_{\{\nu=d(x) \, dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{z \in D^n} \int_{\{\nu'=d'(x) \, dx \in \hat{H}\}} (f(\nu') - f_r(\nu'))^2 \times \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{\prod_{j=1}^n d'(z_j)}{\int_{\{\nu''=d''(x) \, dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j=1}^n d''(z_j) \, \nu(d\nu'')} \right) \nu(d\nu') \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \, dz \, \nu(d\nu') \\ &= \int_{\{\nu'=d'(x) \, dx \in \hat{H}\}} (f(\nu') - f_r(\nu'))^2 \int_{z \in D^n} \prod_{j=1}^n d'(z_j) \, dz \, \nu(d\nu') = \|f - f_r\|_{L^2(E, \nu)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This and (4.45) and (4.46) for f_r give now (4.45) and (4.46) for f by letting $r \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

For $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, $z := (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $y := (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n)$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $g \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_g(z) &:= \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{d\mu_x^n}{d\sigma}(y) s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n) \right)(x) \, dx \\ &= \int_{x \in D^n} \frac{m_x^n(dz)}{dz} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n) \right)(x) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.10 *Suppose (l)-(lll).*

(a) (Partial integration) All $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ restricted to E_n belong to $D(A'_n)$ and $g = \mathbb{1}$ belongs also to $D(A'_n)$ and we have

$$\widetilde{A'_n g} = -\frac{\left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n) \right)}{\tilde{m}_n} + \frac{\zeta_g}{\tilde{m}_n} \in C(\overline{D^n}).$$

Furthermore, $\|A'_n \mathbb{1}\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $-\lambda_1 c^2$ where c is the constant specified in condition (l). For every $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, the norm $\|A'_n g\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(b) Assume, in addition, (jjj) and (jv). Let $g \in \mathcal{C}$, $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$, and $f_n \in D(\hat{A}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such

that there exists a sequence $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} f$ and $\langle f_n - \varphi_n, f_n - \varphi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. Then we have

$$\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle \hat{A} f, g \rangle.$$

(c) Suppose (jjj) and (jv'). Let $g \in D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $f \in L^2(E, \nu)$, and $f_n \in D(\hat{A}_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\langle A_n f_n, A_n f_n \rangle_n$ is bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exists a sequence $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{C}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} f$ and $\langle f_n - \varphi_n, f_n - \varphi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. Then we have

$$\langle -\hat{A}_n f_n, g \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle f, \hat{A} g \rangle.$$

Proof. *Step 1* We prepare the verification of part (a). Let B_j^D denote the process obtained from B_j by killing upon hitting ∂D . Furthermore, let $p^D(t, x_j, z_j)$ denote the transition density of B_j^D from $x_j \in D$ to $z_j \in D$ in $t > 0$ units of time, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(z) &= \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{y_i \in \partial D} \frac{d\mu_x^n(y)}{d\sigma} s(dy_i) \cdot \eta(z_i) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx \\ &= \int_{x \in D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{P_{x_j}(\tau_j \geq t, B_{j,t} \in dz_j)}{dz_j} P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt) \cdot \eta(z_i) \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(z_i) \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j \neq i} p^D(t, x_j, z_j) P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

From, for example, the spectral resolution of $P_{x_i}(\tau_i \in dt)$ with respect to the eigenfunctions of Δ_i we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(z) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(z_i) \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{t=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j \neq i} p^D(t, x_j, z_j) \int_{v \in D} p^D(t, x_i, v) dv dt \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i\right) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(z_i) \int_{v \in D} \int_{x \in D^n} K^{D^n}(x, z^{(i)}(v)) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i\right) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx dv \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(z_i) \int_{v \in D} \int_{x \in D^n} K^{D^n}(x, z^{(i)}(v)) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta\right) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n\right)(x) dx dv \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{n, z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n\right)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

where, for the third equality sign, we have used (l). This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{\left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} + \frac{\zeta_1(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{n} \frac{\left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n\right)(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} + \frac{\eta_{n, z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n\right)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

Step 2 We prove part (a). For this we keep Lemma 4.4 (b) and (d) in mind. Let $f \in D_b^2(A_n) \cup \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ and $g \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \cup \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. Denoting by $\mathbf{n}_n$ the inner normal vector

on ∂D^n we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n &= \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\frac{1}{2}\Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n)}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} \cdot \frac{d(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n)}{d\mathbf{n}_n} d\sigma \\
&= \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n + \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\nabla \tilde{g} \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n \\
&\quad - \int_{D^n} \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n + \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx). \tag{4.49}
\end{aligned}$$

By means of Lebesgue's theorem on monotone convergence we get (4.25) and (4.26) for all $f \in D_b^2(A_n)$. With this (4.49) specifies for $g = \mathbb{1}$ and $f \in D_b^2(A_n)$ to

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle A_n f, \mathbb{1} \rangle_n &= \left\langle \frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{f}, \tilde{\mathbb{1}} \right\rangle_n \\
&= - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n + \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
&= - \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n + \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{D^n} \tilde{f} dm_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\
&= - \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{m}_n)}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n + \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\zeta_1}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n. \tag{4.50}
\end{aligned}$$

According to (I)-(III) and (4.47) we have $(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{m}_n)/\tilde{m}_n \in C(\overline{D^n})$ and $\zeta_1/\tilde{m}_n \in C(\overline{D^n})$. By (4.50), the result of Step 1, and Lemma 4.8 we find that $g = \mathbb{1}$ belongs to $D(A'_n)$, that we have

$$\widetilde{A'_n \mathbb{1}} = -\frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(\tilde{m}_n))}{\tilde{m}_n} + \frac{\zeta_1}{\tilde{m}_n} \in C(\overline{D^n}),$$

and that $\|A'_n \mathbb{1}\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $-\lambda_1 c^2$. Now, let $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. Replacing $\tilde{m}_n$ with $\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n$ relation (4.50) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle A_n f, g \rangle_n &= \left\langle \frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n \\
&= - \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n))}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n + \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\zeta_g}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n, \quad f \in D_b^2(A_n).
\end{aligned}$$

We mention that the verification of $\zeta_g/\tilde{m}_n \in C(\overline{D^n})$ is similar to $\zeta_1/\tilde{m}_n \in C(\overline{D^n})$ above, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

It remains to show in the rest of the present Step 2 that, for $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, $\|A'_n g\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For this, we replace in (4.47) $\tilde{m}_n$ by $\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n$ and obtain for all $z \in D^n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{A'_n g}(z) &= -\frac{(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta(\tilde{g}\tilde{m}_n))(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} + \frac{\zeta_g(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\
&= (\frac{1}{2}\Delta \tilde{g})(z) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} (-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_i \tilde{g})(z^{(i)}(v)) \cdot \tilde{m}_n(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\nabla \tilde{g}(z) \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} \nabla_i \tilde{g}(z^{(i)}(v)) \cdot \nabla_i \tilde{m}_n(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\
& + \tilde{g}(z) \cdot \widetilde{A'_n \mathbb{I}}(z) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(z_i) \int_{v \in D} (\tilde{g}(z^{(i)}(v)) - \tilde{g}(z)) \cdot (-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\
& = T_1(z) + T_2(z) + T_3(z), \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_n), \quad z_1, \dots, z_n \in D,
\end{aligned}$$

linewise, where ∇_i , similar to Δ_i , denotes the d -dimensional gradient with respect to i -th d -dimensional argument and the product sign between two gradients stands for the scalar product in the corresponding Euclidean vector spaces. Furthermore, we note that $|\eta_{n,z\{i\}}(v)| \leq c_1 \cdot h_1(v)$ for some positive constant c_1 which is by the second line of (III) and (I) uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z\{i\}$. From (4.4) we take the representation $g(\nu) = \psi((h_1, \nu), \dots, (h_r, \nu)) \cdot \psi_0((k, \nu)) \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. With $\Psi(z) := \psi\left((h_1, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j}), \dots, (h_r, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j})\right)$, $\Psi_0(z) := \psi_0\left((k, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{z_j})\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
T(z, v) &= \sum_{j=1}^r \lambda_j \cdot \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_j}(z) \cdot \Psi_0(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} h_j(v) + \Psi(z) \cdot \frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial x}(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta k\right)(v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{j,j'=1}^r \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x_j \partial x_{j'}}(z) \cdot \Psi_0(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} (\nabla h_j \cdot \nabla h_{j'})(v) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2n} \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_j}(z) \frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial x}(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} (\nabla h_j \cdot \nabla k)(v) + \Psi(z) \cdot \frac{\partial^2 \Psi_0}{\partial x^2}(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} (\nabla k \cdot \nabla k)(v) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

it holds that $(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{g})(z) = \sum_{l=1}^n T(z, z_l)$ and $(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{g})(z^{(i)}(v)) = T(z, v)$ and thus $\|(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{g})\| \leq c_2$ and $\|-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{g}\| \leq c_3/n$ with positive constants c_2, c_3 not depending on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_1(z)| &\leq c_2 + c_1 c_3 \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{v \in D} \tilde{m}_n(z^{(i)}(v)) dv \cdot h_1(z_i) \right)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \\
&\leq c_2 + c_1 c_3 \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\{\nu=d(x) \mid dx \in \hat{H}\}} \prod_{j \neq i}^n d(z_j) \nu(d\nu) \cdot h_1(z_i) \right)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)}
\end{aligned}$$

and with condition (I), $\|T_1\|_{C_b(E_n)} \leq c_2 + c_1 c_3 c$. We continue with the investigation of T_2 . We have

$$\nabla_i \tilde{g}(z) = \Psi_0(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_j}(z) \cdot \nabla h_j(z_i) + \Psi(z) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial \Psi_0}{\partial x}(z) \cdot \nabla k(z_i), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

and $\nabla \tilde{g}(z) = \left((\nabla_1 \tilde{g}(z))^T, \dots, (\nabla_n \tilde{g}(z))^T \right)^T$. Furthermore, we note that according to (4.4) $\text{supp } \tilde{g} = K^n$ for some compact subset K of D . Therefore, $\|\nabla_i \tilde{g}\| \equiv \|\nabla_i \tilde{g}\|_{C(\overline{D^n}; \mathbb{R}^d)} = \|\nabla_i \tilde{g}\|_{C(K^n; \mathbb{R}^d)} \leq c_4/n$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\|\nabla \tilde{g}\| \equiv \|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{C(\overline{D^n}; \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d})} = \|\nabla \tilde{g}\|_{C(K^n; \mathbb{R}^{n \cdot d})} \leq c_4/\sqrt{n}$ for some $c_4 > 0$ which is independent on $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

In addition, by condition (l), $(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta d)$ is bounded on D uniformly in $\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. Accordingly, Gauss' theorem in thin tubes (cylinders) shows that ∇d is also bounded on D uniformly in $\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. In other words, there is $c_5 > 0$ such that $\|\nabla d\| \equiv \|\nabla d\|_{C(\overline{D}; \mathbb{R}^d)} < c_5$, uniformly in $\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$. In particular, we get from (ll)

$$\nabla_i \tilde{m}_n(z) = \int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \nabla d(z_i) \prod_{j \neq i}^n d(z_j) \nu(d\nu), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

and $\nabla \tilde{m}_n(z) = \left((\nabla_1 \tilde{m}_n(z))^T, \dots, (\nabla_n \tilde{m}_n(z))^T \right)^T$. With (l) and (ll) it follows that

$$\left| \frac{\nabla \tilde{g}(z) \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n(z)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \right| \leq c_4 \cdot \sup_{\substack{v \in K \\ \nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}}} \frac{|\nabla d(v)|}{d(v)} \leq c_4 c_5 c \cdot \sup_{v \in K} h_1^{-1}(v), \quad z \in D^n,$$

and

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \int_{v \in D} \nabla_i \tilde{g}(z^{(i)}(v)) \cdot \nabla_i \tilde{m}_n(z^{(i)}(v)) dv \cdot h_1(z_i) \right|}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \leq c_4 c \cdot \sup_{\substack{v \in K \\ \nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}}} |\nabla d(v)| \cdot |D|,$$

$z \in D^n$, which gives $\|T_2\|_{C_b(E_n)} \leq c_4 c_5 c \cdot \sup_{v \in K} h_1^{-1}(v) + c_1 c_4 c_5 c \cdot |D|$. We turn to the estimation of T_3 . It holds that

$$|\tilde{g}(z^{(i)}(v)) - \tilde{g}(z)| \leq \|\nabla_i \tilde{g}\| \cdot |z^{(i)}(v) - z| \leq \frac{1}{n} c_4 \cdot \text{diam}(D), \quad z \in D^n, v \in D,$$

where $\text{diam}(D)$ denotes the diameter of D . Together with conditions (l) and (ll) this yields

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \int_{v \in D} (\tilde{g}(z^{(i)}(v)) - \tilde{g}(z)) \cdot (-\frac{1}{2} \Delta_i \tilde{m}_n)(z^{(i)}(v)) dv \cdot h_1(z_i) \right|}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \leq c_4 c^3 \cdot \text{diam}(D)$$

for all $z \in D^n$, $v \in D$, and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore $\|T_3\|_{C_b(E_n)} \leq \|g\|_{C_b(E_n)} \cdot (-\lambda_1) c^2 + c_1 c_4 c^3 \cdot \text{diam}(D)$. We have shown that $\|A'_n g\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Step 3 We demonstrate part (b). We get from Proposition 4.5 (c) and (4.27), (4.49) for $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\nabla \tilde{g} \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n = -2 \langle f, Bg \rangle. \quad (4.51)$$

With this (4.49), and (4.50) we find for $f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ and $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle f, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n &= \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n + \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\nabla \tilde{g} \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n \\ &\quad - \int_{D^n} \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n + \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d \left(\int_{x \in D^n} m_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right) \\ &= \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{g} \right\rangle_n + \left\langle \tilde{f}, \frac{\nabla \tilde{g} \cdot \nabla \tilde{m}_n}{\tilde{m}_n} \right\rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{g} \tilde{f} d \left(\int_{x \in D^n} \mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) - \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using, in this order, (4.27), (4.51), and again Proposition 4.5 (b),(c) we verify

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle f, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle f, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n \\
& \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, Bg \rangle - 2\langle f, Bg \rangle - \frac{1}{2} (\langle Cf, g \rangle + \langle f, Cg \rangle) + \frac{1}{2} (\langle Bf, g \rangle + \langle f, Bg \rangle) \\
& = \langle Bf, g \rangle - \frac{1}{2} (\langle Bf, g \rangle + \langle f, Bg \rangle) - \frac{1}{2} (\langle Cf, g \rangle + \langle f, Cg \rangle) \\
& = \langle Bf, g \rangle - \frac{1}{2} (\langle Af, g \rangle + \langle f, Ag \rangle) .
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use Corollary 4.3, Proposition 4.5 (a), especially (4.37), and recall the definitions of the space $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ in (4.4) and the operator C to derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle f, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n & \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle Bf, g \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int f g \delta(A^f) d\nu \\
& = \langle Bf, g \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot f, g \rangle \\
& = \langle Af, g \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot f, g \rangle \\
& = \langle \hat{A}f, g \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4.2 as well as Corollary 4.3 it follows that

$$\langle f, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle f, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\langle f, \hat{A}g \rangle, \quad f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E), \quad g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E) .$$

According to part (a) of this proposition and Lemma 4.9 (c) there is a sequence $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\psi_n = A'_n g - \frac{1}{2} A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g$ on E_n and $\|\psi_n\|_{C_b(E_n)}$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now Lemma 4.9 (b) implies $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} -\hat{A}g$. In order to prove even s -convergence we observe that by Part (a) and (4.43)-(4.48)

$$\widetilde{A'_n \mathbb{I}}(z) = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int ((\frac{1}{2} \Delta d)(z_i) / d(z_i)) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) d\nu}{\tilde{m}_n(z)}, \quad z = (z_1, \dots, z_n),$$

$z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$ and thus for $\psi \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle A'_n \mathbb{I}, \psi \rangle_n & = \int_{z \in D^n} \frac{\tilde{\psi}(z)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int ((\frac{1}{2} \Delta d)(z_i) / d(z_i)) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) d\nu dz_1 \dots dz_n \\
& = \int \int_{z \in D^n} \tilde{\psi}(z) \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} \Delta d}{d}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) dz_1 \dots dz_n d\nu \\
& \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \psi(\nu) \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta d, \mathbb{I} \right) \nu(d\nu)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.52}$$

where, for the second line, Fubini's theorem applies because of condition (l) and, for the third line, we use $\nu_n \implies \nu$, cf. (kw) and Proposition 4.6, Lemma 2.1 (a), (d), and Proposition

3.1 together with the remark underneath. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n &= \int \tilde{g}^2(z) \left(\frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta d \right) (z_i) / d(z_i) \right) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) d\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} \right)^2 \tilde{\nu}_n(dz) \\
&= \int_{z \in D^n} \tilde{g}^2(z) \left(\int \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} \Delta d}{d}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \cdot \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j)}{\tilde{m}_n(z)} d\boldsymbol{\nu} \right)^2 \tilde{m}_n(z) dz_1 \dots dz_n \\
&= \int_{\{\nu=d'(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \int_{z \in D^n} \tilde{g}^2(z) \left(\int_{\{\nu=d(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} \Delta d}{d}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \right) \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^n d(z_j) \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu)} \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu) \right)^2 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n d'(z_j) dz_1 \dots dz_n \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu') \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{\nu'=d'(x) dx \in \hat{H}\}} g^2(\nu') \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta d', \mathbb{I} \right)^2 \boldsymbol{\nu}(d\nu') = \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot g, A' \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle, \tag{4.53}
\end{aligned}$$

the limit by Proposition 4.7 (b). In order to show $\langle A'_n g, \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A' g, \psi \rangle$ as well as $\langle A'_n g, A'_n g \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A' g, A' g \rangle$ one may proceed as in Step 2 and individually prove convergence of $\langle T_i, \psi \rangle_n$ and $\langle T_i, T_i \rangle_n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by plugging in (II) as well as (III) and repeating the way we have concluded in (4.52) and (4.53). We omit this long calculation here in the paper.

One obtains finally $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} -\hat{A}g$. Combining this with $\mathcal{C} \ni \varphi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} f \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$, Proposition 2.3 (c) gives

$$\langle \varphi_n, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle \varphi_n, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n = \langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\langle f, \hat{A}g \rangle, \quad g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E).$$

For $f_n \in D(\hat{A}_n)$ with $\langle f_n - \varphi_n, f_n - \varphi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ we have therefore

$$\langle f_n, A'_n g \rangle_n - \frac{1}{2} \langle f_n, A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n = \langle f_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} -\langle f, \hat{A}g \rangle, \quad g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E).$$

According to Corollary 4.3 this yields

$$\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \hat{A}f, g \rangle. \tag{4.54}$$

for all $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$. Recalling Lemma 4.9 (a) one may choose a sequence $F_n \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with

$$\langle F_n - \hat{A}_n f_n, F_n - \hat{A}_n f_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \tag{4.55}$$

and therefore

$$\langle F_n, g \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \hat{A}f, g \rangle, \quad g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E). \tag{4.56}$$

If one chooses in [14] $\mathcal{C} = \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ then it follows from Proposition 3.3 (a) of the same reference that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle F_n, F_n \rangle_n < \infty$. Now (4.56) and Lemma 4.9 (b) imply that $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \hat{A}f$. This and (4.55) yield (4.54) for all $g \in \mathcal{C}$; here $\mathcal{C}$ in the sense of the present paper. We have proved part (b) of the proposition.

Step 4 We prove part (c). First let $g \in \tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ and note that in this case $g \in D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ by Lemma 4.2 (b) and (c_1') , (c_2') in the introduction to Section 3. As verified in the previous

step, there is a sequence $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\psi_n = A'_n g - \frac{1}{2} A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g$ on E_n and $\psi_n \xrightarrow{s} -\hat{A}g$. Furthermore, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\psi_n\|_{C_b(E_n)} < \infty$ by Step 2 and $\langle f_n - \varphi_n, f_n - \varphi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ by hypothesis which show $\langle f_n - \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Using Proposition 2.3 (c) and the hypothesis $\varphi_n \xrightarrow{w} f$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g \rangle_n &= -\langle f_n, A'_n g - \frac{1}{2} A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \rangle_n \\ &= -\langle \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n - \langle f_n - \varphi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, \hat{A}g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For general $g \in D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ the claim is a consequence of approximation as follows. First we remind of the facts that by definition (2.15), condition (jv') together with Corollary 4.3, i. e., $A' \mathbb{I} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$, and Lemma 4.2 (c) the set $\tilde{C}_0^2(E)$ is dense in $D(\hat{A})$ with respect to the graph norm $(\langle g, g \rangle + \langle \hat{A}g, \hat{A}g \rangle)^{1/2}$. In particular, $\tilde{C}_0^2(E) \ni g_r \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} g \in D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ in the graph norm yields $\hat{A}g_r \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} \hat{A}g$ as well as $g_r \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} g$, both in $L^2(E, \nu)$. Furthermore, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_n f_n, A_n f_n \rangle_n < \infty$ by hypothesis. Now, for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| -\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g \rangle_n - \langle f, \hat{A}g \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left| \langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g - g_r \rangle_n \right| + \left| -\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g_r \rangle_n - \langle f, \hat{A}g_r \rangle \right| + \left| \langle f, \hat{A}g_r - \hat{A}g \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \hat{A}_n f_n, \hat{A}_n f_n \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle g - g_r, g - g_r \rangle_n^{1/2} + \left| -\langle \hat{A}_n f_n, g_r \rangle_n - \langle f, \hat{A}g_r \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \langle f, f \rangle^{1/2} \langle \hat{A}g_r - \hat{A}g, \hat{A}g_r - \hat{A}g \rangle^{1/2} \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \hat{A}_n f_n, \hat{A}_n f_n \rangle_n^{1/2} \langle g - g_r, g - g_r \rangle_n^{1/2} + \langle f, f \rangle^{1/2} \langle \hat{A}g_r - \hat{A}g, \hat{A}g_r - \hat{A}g \rangle^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

□

4.6 Verifying Mosco Type Convergence

We recall that under (jjj),(jv') and (l)-(lll), $C := \frac{1}{2} \|A' \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)} \vee \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2} \|A'_n \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu_n)} < \infty$, cf. Corollary 4.3, Remark (12) of this section, and Proposition 4.10 (a).

Proposition 4.11 *Suppose (jjj) and (l)-(lll). (a) Assume (jv). For $\nu = d(x) dx \in \hat{H}$, i. e., for ν -a.e. $\nu \in E$, we have the representation $-\delta(A^f)(\nu) = A' \mathbb{I}(\nu) = (\frac{1}{2} \Delta d, \mathbb{I})$. (b) Suppose (jv'). For all $g \in L^2(E, \nu)$, all sequences $g_n \in \mathcal{C}$ s -converging to g , and all $\beta > 2C$, we have $G_{n, \beta} g_n \xrightarrow{s} G_\beta g$.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from (4.52) and (4.57) below where we also recall Corollary 4.3. In Step 1 we verify condition (c6). In Step 2 conditions (c3'(i)) and (c3'(ii)) are verified. In Steps 3-5, we demonstrate that the forms $\hat{S}_n$ converge to the form $\hat{S}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the sense of Definition 2.4. What we claim is then a consequence of Lemma 2.13, Theorem 2.14 (c), and Remark (9) of Section 2.

Step 1 Let us verify condition (c6). Lemma 4.2 (a) together with Proposition 4.1 (a) implies

$$T'_t \mathbb{I} = \frac{d\nu \circ \nu_{-t}}{d\nu} = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \delta(A^f)(\nu_{-s}) ds \right\}.$$

From this and (jv'), we obtain (c6(ii)). We also figure that $\mathbb{I} \in D(A')$, the first part of (c6(i)). Anything else required in (c6(i)) has been shown in Proposition 4.10 (a). Condition (c6(iv)) has been verified in Lemma 4.4 (d).

In the remainder of the present step, let us focus on (c6(iii)). Recalling (c1'), (c2'), and $\nu_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{kw}} \nu$ by (kw) and Proposition 4.6, we get the implication $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}$ yields $\varphi \cdot \psi \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore, with Proposition 4.10 (b),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi, \psi \rangle_n &= -2 \left\langle \hat{A}_n \mathbb{I}, \varphi \cdot \psi \right\rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} -2 \left\langle \hat{A} \mathbb{I}, \varphi \cdot \psi \right\rangle = \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi, \psi \rangle, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (4.57)$$

In order to show that even $A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}$, we re-verify (4.53) with φ instead of g . This completes the verification of (c6(iii)).

Step 2 According to (c1') in the introduction to Section 3, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathcal{C} \subseteq L^\infty(E, \nu_n)$. Condition (c3'(ii)), that is $\mathcal{G}_n = \{G_{n,\beta}g : g \in L^\infty(E, \nu_n), \beta > 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, is because of (c1') in Section 3 and Lemma 4.9 (c) equivalent to $G_{n,\beta}g \in C(E'_n)$, $g \in L^\infty(E, \nu_n)$. The latter is a repetition of the arguments in [13], Proposition 1 and Step 2 of the proof of [13], Lemma 3 (a). Condition (c3'(i)) is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.9 (d).

Step 3 The objective of this step is to verify condition (i) of Definition 2.4 for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S . Let $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$. We assume that there is a subsequence n_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of indices and $\varphi_{n_k} \in D(A_{n_k}) \cap \mathcal{C}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\varphi_{n_k} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{w} \varphi$ and $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$. Let $g \in D(A) \cap \mathcal{C}$. We note that Proposition 4.10 (c) holds also for subsequences n_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, of indices. Thus, we have

$$\left\langle \hat{A}_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, g \right\rangle_{n_k} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} - \left\langle \varphi, \hat{A}g \right\rangle$$

which is equivalent to

$$\langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, g \rangle_{n_k} - \left\langle \frac{1}{2} A'_{n_k} \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi_{n_k}, g \right\rangle_{n_k} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} - \langle \varphi, Ag \rangle + \left\langle \frac{1}{2} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi, g \right\rangle$$

and

$$\langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, g \rangle_{n_k} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} - \langle \varphi, Ag \rangle + \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi, g \rangle \quad (4.58)$$

because of $A'_n \mathbb{I} \cdot g \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} A' \mathbb{I} \cdot g$ demonstrated in Step 1. By $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k}, A_{n_k} \varphi_{n_k} \rangle_{n_k} < \infty$ and Proposition 2.3 (b) for such a subsequence φ_{n_k} , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a (sub)subsequence φ_{n_l} , $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and an element $F \in L^2(E, \nu)$ with

$$\langle A_{n_l} \varphi_{n_l}, g \rangle_{n_l} \xrightarrow[l \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle F, g \rangle. \quad (4.59)$$

By Lemma 4.2 (b), $\tilde{C}_b^2 \subseteq D(A) \cap \mathcal{C}$ which together with Lemma 4.2 (c) says that $D(A) \cap \mathcal{C}$ is dense in $D(A)$ with respect to the graph norm $(\langle f, f \rangle + \langle Af, Af \rangle)^{1/2}$. By (4.58) and (4.59) we obtain for $\varphi \in L^2(E, \nu)$,

$$\langle \varphi, Ag \rangle = \langle A' \mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi - F, g \rangle, \quad g \in D(A).$$

In other words, we have $\varphi \in D(A')$ and $A'\varphi = A'\mathbb{I} \cdot \varphi - F$. Taking into consideration Corollary 4.3 (b), we even get $\varphi \in D(A)$. Recalling also Corollary 4.3 (a), we obtain

$$\hat{S}(\varphi, \varphi) = \langle -A\varphi, \varphi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \delta(A^f) \cdot \varphi, \varphi \rangle = 0$$

which verifies condition (i) of Definition 2.4.

Step 4 In order to verify condition (ii) of Definition 2.4 for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S , let us first restrict ourselves to $\psi \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \left(\subseteq D(\hat{A}) \right)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $\psi_n \in D(\hat{A}_n)$ with $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{s} \psi$. In particular, this guarantees

$$\langle \psi_n - \psi, \psi_n - \psi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0. \quad (4.60)$$

By Proposition 4.10 (b) we have

$$\langle -\hat{A}_n \psi_n, \varphi \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle -\hat{A} \psi, \varphi \rangle, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Lemma 4.9 (c) yields the existence of a sequence $\Psi_n \in \mathcal{C}$ with

$$\langle -\hat{A}_n \psi_n - \Psi_n, -\hat{A}_n \psi_n - \Psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 \quad (4.61)$$

It follows from the last two relations that $-\Psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \hat{A} \psi$. Furthermore, according to (4.60) we have $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n < \infty$. With (4.61) this shows $\langle -\hat{A}_n \psi_n - \Psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$. Proposition 2.3 (c) implies now

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}_n(\psi_n, \psi_n) &= \langle \Psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n + \langle -\hat{A}_n \psi_n - \Psi_n, \psi_n \rangle_n \\ &\xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \langle -\hat{A} \psi, \psi \rangle = \hat{S}(\psi, \psi). \end{aligned}$$

For general $\psi \in D(\hat{S}) = D(\hat{A})$, condition (ii) of Definition 2.4 follows by approximation. Here we remind of the facts that by definition (2.15), $A'\mathbb{I} \in L^\infty(E, \nu)$ cf. condition (jv') together with Corollary 4.3, and Lemma 4.2 (c) the set $\tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ is dense in $D(\hat{A})$ with respect to the graph norm $(\langle f, f \rangle + \langle \hat{A}f, \hat{A}f \rangle)^{1/2}$.

Step 5 Let us verify condition (iv) for $\hat{A}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and A which is because of Lemma 2.6 sufficient for (iii) of Definition 2.4 for $\hat{S}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and S . For this, let $D(S_n) \ni u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} v$ for some $v \in L^2(E, \nu)$. Let $u \in D(S)$ and suppose $\beta u_n - \hat{A}_n u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \beta u - \hat{A}u$. One consequence is $\hat{A}_n u_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{w} \beta(v-u) + \hat{A}u$ which, by Proposition 2.3 (a), says that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \hat{A}_n u_n, \hat{A}_n u_n \rangle_n < \infty$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, \beta g + \hat{A}g \rangle &= \langle \beta u - \hat{A}u, g \rangle \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \beta u_n, g \rangle_n + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle -\hat{A}_n u_n, g \rangle_n \\ &= \langle v, \beta g + \hat{A}g \rangle, \quad g \in D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first line is true because of (4.23) and the third line is true because of Proposition 4.10 (c). Choose $g = \hat{G}_\beta f$, $f \in \mathcal{C}$. Recalling that by Step 2 of this proof and Lemma 2.13 (a) it holds that $g \in D(\hat{S}) \cap \mathcal{C} = D(\hat{A}) \cap \mathcal{C}$ it turns out that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle u - v, 2\beta \hat{G}_\beta f - f \rangle \\ &= \langle 2\beta \hat{G}'_\beta(u - v) - (u - v), f \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1 (c), $2\beta \hat{G}'_\beta(u - v) = u - v$ which implies $u - v \in D(\hat{A}')$ and $-\beta(u - v) = \hat{A}'(u - v)$. Since $\hat{A}'$ is an antisymmetric operator, $-\beta < 0$ is not an eigenvalue. Consequently, $u = v$. $\square$

4.7 Relative Compactness

In this subsection, we establish relative compactness of the family of processes $\mathbf{X}^n = ((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout the whole subsection we assume (jjj), (jv') and (l)-(lll), and $\beta > \|A'\mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu)} \vee \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|A'_n \mathbb{I}\|_{L^\infty(E, \nu_n)} = 2C$, recall for this Proposition 4.10 (a) and the assumptions of the previous subsection. Let

$$\tilde{C}_b(E) := \left\{ f = \varphi((h_1, \cdot), \dots, (h_r, \cdot)) \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) : \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} \cdot (h_i, \cdot) = 0 \right\}.$$

For such an element $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$ we note that

$$f - \frac{1}{\beta} A f = f - \frac{1}{\beta} B f =: g \equiv g(f) \in \mathcal{C} \quad (4.62)$$

by Lemma 4.2. For this we have recalled conditions (c1') and (c2') from the beginning of Section 3 and Proposition 3.1. For $n \geq 2$, $F \in C_r(D^n)$, and $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$, set

$$e_F(y) := \int_{z_i \in D} (F(z) - F(y)) \eta_{n, z\{i\}}(z_i) dz_i.$$

For $n \geq 2$ identify $\partial^{(1)} D^n$ with ∂D^n . Let $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$ and $g \equiv g(f)$ as in (4.62). Define

$$b(n) := \frac{1}{(\beta - 2C) \cdot \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} B f \right\|^2} \cdot \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \left| e_{(\tilde{f} - \beta \widetilde{G_{n, \beta} g})^2}(y) \right| \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx). \quad (4.63)$$

Furthermore, for B defined in (3.1) and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, put $\hat{B} \equiv \hat{B}_n(\psi) := \{\psi^2 \geq \mathbb{E}.e^{-\beta \tau_{B^c}}\}$ where ψ is some bounded everywhere on E_n defined function which we specify below. Let us denote by E , A , $\hat{A}$, $\tau_{A^c} \equiv \tau_{\hat{A}^c}^n$ the images of $\mathbb{E}$, B , $\hat{B}$, $\tau_{B^c} \equiv \tau_{\hat{B}^c}^n$ under the map $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{z_i} \rightarrow (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \overline{D}$, taking into consideration invariance under permutations of $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$.

Lemma 4.12 *For $n \geq 2$, $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, and $g \equiv g(f)$ the integral (4.63) is finite and we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} b(n) = 0.$$

Proof. The proof uses ideas of the proof of Lemma 5 in [13], Lemma 5. However the jump mechanism and the measures ν_n , ν used in the present paper differ from those used in [13] and lead to different technical details which are necessary to point out. Note also that the notation in [13] is slightly different.

Step 1 Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ in this step and define $\Psi := f - \beta G_{n, \beta} g$. As above, let $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_i) \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $y_i \in \partial D$, $z_1, \dots, z_n \in D$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\Psi^2}(y) &= \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{\Psi}(z) - \tilde{\Psi}(y) \right) \left(\tilde{\Psi}(z) + \tilde{\Psi}(y) \right) \eta_{n, z\{i\}}(z_i) dz_i \\ &= \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \left(\tilde{f}(z) + \tilde{f}(y) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n, \beta} g}(z) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n, \beta} g}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ &\quad - \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n, \beta} g}(z) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n, \beta} g}(y) \right) \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n, \beta} g}(z) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \end{aligned}$$

because of (4.25) which reads as $\int_{z_i \in D} \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(z) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i = 0$. Using this again, we continue by

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\tilde{\Psi}^2}(y) &= e_{\tilde{f}^2}(y) - 2 \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(z) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ &\quad + \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\left(\widetilde{G_{n,\beta} g}(z) \right)^2 - \left(\widetilde{G_{n,\beta} g}(y) \right)^2 \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \\ &= e_{\tilde{f}^2}(y) - 2 \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(z) \eta(z_i) dz_i + e_{(\widetilde{G_{n,\beta} g})^2}(y). \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

Step 2 Let us consider the particular items of (4.64). Since $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$ yields $f^2 \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$, we obtain by Proposition 4.5 (a) and (4.42)

$$\int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} |e_{\tilde{f}^2}(y)| \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (4.65)$$

For the second item in (4.64) we recall Proposition 4.5 (a) and the appendix below (4.42). We use the inequality $\left| \widetilde{G_{n,\beta} g}(x) - \widetilde{G_{n,\beta} g}(y) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\beta} \sup_{\{z \in D^n: z+y-x \in D^n\}} |g(z) - g(z+y-x)|$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the fact that $g = f - \frac{1}{\beta} A f = f - \frac{1}{\beta} B f$ is a bounded continuously differentiable cylindric function because of $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \left| \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{f}(z) - \tilde{f}(y) \right) \times \right. \\ \left. \times \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(z) \eta(z_i) dz_i \right| \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.66)$$

In order to handle the third item in (4.64) we observe that by (4.25) $e_{(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g})^2} = \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(z) - \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g}(y) \right)^2 \eta(z_i) dz_i \geq 0$. Furthermore, by Lemma 4.4 (c) and multidimensional differential calculus,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} |e_{(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g})^2}| d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} e_{(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g})^2} d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \int \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n \right) (x) dx \\ &= \int \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n + \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int \left(\tilde{T}_{n,t} \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 - \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &= - \int \Delta \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int \left(\nabla \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 d\tilde{\nu}_n + \int \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \tilde{A}'_n \mathbb{1} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\leq 2\beta \int \left(\tilde{g} - \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right) \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} d\tilde{\nu}_n + \int \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \tilde{A}'_n \mathbb{1} d\tilde{\nu}_n \end{aligned}$$

By the Mosco type convergence of Proposition 4.11 and Proposition 2.3 (c), we get the limit

$$\int \left(\tilde{g} - \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right) \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} d\tilde{\nu}_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle g - \beta G_{\beta} g, \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle.$$

In addition, $\varphi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\varphi = \beta G_{n,\beta} g$ on E_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varphi = \beta G_{\beta} g$ ν -a.e. on $E \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ is by Proposition 4.11 an element of $\mathcal{C}$, cf. also (c1') and (c2') of Section 3. Thus, by (4.57), Proposition 4.11 and Proposition 2.3 (c),

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \widetilde{A'_n \mathbb{1}} d\tilde{\nu}_n &= \langle \beta G_{n,\beta} g, A'_n \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi \rangle_n \\ \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \beta G_{\beta} g, A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \varphi \rangle &= \langle \beta G_{\beta} g, A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Putting the last three relations together we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{\partial D^n} \left| e_{(\beta G_{n,\beta} g)^2} \right| d\mu_x^n \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\leq 2\beta \int \left(\tilde{g} - \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right) \cdot \widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} d\tilde{\nu}_n + \int \left(\widetilde{\beta G_{n,\beta} g} \right)^2 \widetilde{A'_n \mathbb{1}} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2\beta \langle g - \beta G_{\beta} g, \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle + \langle \beta G_{\beta} g, A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle \\ &= -2\langle A\beta G_{\beta} g, \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle + \langle \beta G_{\beta} g, A' \mathbb{1} \cdot \beta G_{\beta} g \rangle = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.67}$$

where, for the last equality sign, we recall $f = \beta G_{\beta} g \in \tilde{C}_b(E) \subseteq \tilde{C}_b^2(E)$ which implies $f^2 \in \tilde{C}_b^2(E) \subseteq D(A)$ by Lemma 4.2 (b). The conclusion “= 0” follows now from Corollary 4.3. The lemma is a consequence of (4.64) and the estimates of its items, (4.65)-(4.67). $\square$

Define $|||\frac{1}{2} \Delta g||| := \sup_{\nu \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n} |\frac{1}{2} \Delta g(\nu)|$ and set

$$C_1 = \|f\| + 2|||\frac{1}{2} \Delta f||| + 3\beta\|g\|$$

as well as

$$C_2 := \frac{C_1}{(\beta - 2C) \cdot \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} Bf \right\|^2}$$

where, for the constant C , we recall the introduction to the present subsection. Furthermore, for $n \geq 2$, let

$$\varepsilon_n := \left(C_2 \left(\int (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g)^2 d\nu_n \right)^{1/2} + b(n) \right)^{1/3}.$$

We observe $\varepsilon_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ by the Mosco type convergence of Proposition 4.11 and by Lemma 4.12. For f and g as in (4.62) we specify

$$\psi := \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} Bf \right\|} (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n \|g\|} (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Theorem 4.13 *The family of processes $\mathbf{X}^n = ((X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}, P_{\nu_n})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is relatively compact.*

Proof. Recalling Theorem 3.2 everything to verify is (c7) in Step 1 below and (c8) in Step 2 below.

Step 1 The set $\tilde{C}_b(E)$ is an algebra containing the constant functions. Furthermore, we observe that

$$\left\{ \Phi \left(\sum_{l=1}^{2k} a_l \cdot \ln(h_l, \cdot)^2 \right) : \Phi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}) \text{ with both, } \right. \\ \left. \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} e^{bx} / \Phi(x) \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} e^{-bx} / \Phi(x) \text{ being finite for some } \right. \\ \left. b > \frac{1}{2}, a_l \in \{-1, 1\}, \sum_{l=1}^{2k} a_l = 0, k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is a subset of $\tilde{C}_b(E)$ that separates points in E . The rest of (c7) is a direct consequence of the particular choice of $\tilde{C}_b(E)$ which implies $f - \frac{1}{\beta}Af = f - \frac{1}{\beta}Bf = g \equiv g(f) \in \mathcal{C}$ if $f \in \tilde{C}_b(E)$ as already mentioned in (4.62).

Step 2 By $\beta > 2C$ and (4.28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta - 2C)\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} e^{-\beta\tau_{B^c}} &= (\beta - 2C) \int_{D^n} \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\leq \beta \int_{D^n} \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{D^n} \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \cdot A'_n \tilde{\mathbf{1}} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &= \beta \int_{D^n} \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\quad - \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int \left(\tilde{T}_{n,t}(\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{B^c}}) - \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\leq \beta \int_{D^n} \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\quad - \int_{\hat{A}} \frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{\hat{A}^c} \frac{1}{2} \Delta \left(\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n \\ &\quad - \int \left(\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \right) d \int_{x \in D^n} (m_x^n - \mu_x^n) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{m}_n \right) (x) dx \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

where, for the last “ $\leq$ ” sign, we have taken into consideration that $\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}}$ is convex from below in direction of every vector orthogonal to $\partial\{\tilde{\psi}^2 \geq E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}}\}$. Recalling that $E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}}$ is β -harmonic on $\hat{A}^c$ with respect to $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta - 2C)\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} e^{-\beta\tau_{B^c}} &\leq \beta \int_{\hat{A}} \tilde{\psi}^2 d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{\hat{A}} \frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{\psi}^2 d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \times \\ &\quad \times \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}}(z) - \tilde{\psi}^2 \vee E.e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}}(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (4.69)$$

From the jump mechanism of the process X we observe that, for any $y \in \partial D^n \setminus \partial A$ with $y = (z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n) \in \partial^{(1)} D^n$ where $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n \in D$ and $y_i \in \partial D$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$E_y e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} = \int_{z_i \in D} E_z e^{-\beta\tau_{A^c}} \eta(z_i) dz_i.$$

Here $z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_n$ have been fixed in the notation $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$. With the same notation it follows that

$$\int_{z_i \in D} \tilde{\psi}(z)^2 \vee E_z e^{-\beta \tau_{A^c}} \eta(z_i) dz_i - \tilde{\psi}(y)^2 \vee E_y e^{-\beta \tau_{A^c}} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } y \in \hat{A}^c \cap \partial D^n. \quad (4.70)$$

Putting (4.69) and (4.70) together we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta - 2C) \mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} e^{-\beta \tau_{B^c}} &\leq \int_{\hat{A}} \left(\beta \tilde{\psi}^2 - 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{\psi} \right) \tilde{\psi} \right) d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{D^n} \int_{y \in \hat{A} \cap \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \times \\ &\quad \times \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{\psi}^2(z) \vee E_z e^{-\beta \tau_{A^c}} - \tilde{\psi}^2(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\leq \int \left| \beta \tilde{\psi} - 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{\psi} \right) \right| |\tilde{\psi}| d\tilde{\nu}_n - \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \hat{A} \cap \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \times \\ &\quad \times \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{\psi}^2(z) - \tilde{\psi}^2(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &\leq \int \left| \beta \tilde{\psi} - 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{\psi} \right) \right| |\tilde{\psi}| d\tilde{\nu}_n + \int_{x \in D^n} \int_{y \in \partial D^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_{(y)_i \in \partial D}(y) \times \\ &\quad \times \left| \int_{z_i \in D} \left(\tilde{\psi}^2(z) - \tilde{\psi}^2(y) \right) \eta(z_i) dz_i \right| \mu_x^n(dy) \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_n(dx) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n^2 \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} Bf \right\|^2} \int \left| \beta(f - 2g) - 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta f \right) + \beta^2 G_{n,\beta} g \right| \cdot |f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g| d\nu_n \\ &\quad + \frac{(C - 2\beta) \cdot b(n)}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\beta \|f\| + 2 \left\| \frac{1}{2} \Delta f \right\| + 3\beta \|g\|}{\varepsilon_n^2 \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} Bf \right\|^2} \left(\int (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g)^2 d\nu_n \right)^{1/2} + \frac{(C - 2\beta) \cdot b(n)}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1 \left(\int (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g)^2 d\nu_n \right)^{1/2}}{\varepsilon_n^2 \left\| f - \frac{1}{\beta} Bf \right\|^2} + \frac{(C - 2\beta) \cdot b(n)}{\varepsilon_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, for $n \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_n} e^{-\beta \tau_{B^c}} \leq \frac{C_2 \left(\int (f - \beta G_{n,\beta} g)^2 d\nu_n \right)^{1/2} + b(n)}{\varepsilon_n^2} = \varepsilon_n$$

which gives (c8) by the already verified relation $\varepsilon_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. $\square$

References

- [1] I. BEN-ARI, R. PINSKY, Ergodic behavior of diffusions with random jumps from the boundary. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119** No. 3 (2009), 864-881.

- [2] K. BURDZY, R. HOLYST, P. MARCH, A Fleming-Viot particle representation of the Dirichlet Laplacian. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **214** No. 3 (2000), 679-703.
- [3] V. BOGACHEV, Differentiable measures and the Malliavin calculus. *J. Math. Sci.* **87** No. 4 (1997), 3577-3731.
- [4] V. BOGACHEV, E. MAYER-WOLF, Absolutely continuous flows generated by Sobolev class vector fields in finite and infinite dimensions. *J. Funct. Anal.* **167** (1999), 1-68.
- [5] O. CYBULSKI, V. BABIN, R. HOLYST, Minimization of the Renyi entropy production in the space-partitioning process. *Physical Review E* **71** (2005), 046130–1-046130–10.
- [6] D. DOWN, S. P. MEYN, R. L. TWEEDIE, Exponential and uniform ergodicity of Markov processes. *Ann. Prob.* **23** No. 4 (1995), 1671-1691.
- [7] S. N. ETHIER, T. KURTZ, *Markov processes, Characterization and convergence*, New York Chichester Brisbane Toronto Singapore: John Wiley 1986.
- [8] I. GRIGORESCU, M. KANG, Hydrodynamic limit for a Fleming-Viot type system. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **110** No. 1 (2004), 111-143.
- [9] M. HINO, Convergence of non-symmetric forms. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **38** No. 2 (1998), 329–341.
- [10] A.V. KOLESNIKOV, Convergence of Dirichlet forms with changing speed measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Forum Math.* **17** No. 2 (2005), 225–259.
- [11] A.V. KOLESNIKOV, Mosco convergence of Dirichlet forms in infinite dimensions with changing reference measures. *J. Funct. Anal.* **230** No. 2 (2006), 382–418.
- [12] K. KUWAE, T. SHIOYA, Convergence of spectral structures: a functional analytic theory and its applications to spectral geometry. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **11** No. 4 (2003), 599-673.
- [13] J.-U. LÖBUS, A stationary Fleming-Viot type Brownian particle system. *Math. Z.* **263** No. 3 (2009), 541-581.
- [14] J.-U. LÖBUS, Weak convergence of n -particle systems using bilinear forms. (2011) Preprint. <http://www.mai.liu.se/~julob/Mc.pdf>
- [15] U. MOSCO, Composite media and asymptotic Dirichlet forms. *J. Funct. Anal.* **123** No. 2 (1994), 368-421.
- [16] A. PAZY, *Semigroups of linear operators and applications to partial differential equations*, New York: Springer 1983.
- [17] W. SUN, Weak convergence of Dirichlet processes. *Sci. China Ser. A* **41** No. 1 (1998), 8–21.
- [18] K. YOSIDA, *Functional Analysis*, Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer 1980.